ALEXANDER FORBES OF BRECHIN (1817-1875): THE FIRST TRACTARIAN BISHOP.

ROWAN G.W. STRONG.

Presented to the Faculty of Divinity,
University of Edinburgh.

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1992

DECLARATION.

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and that it has neither been published nor submitted, in whole or in part, elsewhere.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

Any research sustained over three years incurs a number of debts by the author and I take this opportunity to gladly acknowledge mine. Two scholars who gave me initial encouragement and support to embark on doctoral research and who have honoured me with their friendship are Professor John Macquarrie of Oxford University and the Revd. Dr. Austin Cooper, Master of the Catholic Theological College, Melbourne. Dr. Gavin White of Glasgow University, and Canon A.M.Allchin have kindly shared relevant material with me and assisted with specific enquiries. No historian would be able to function without the unstinting help of the staff of many libraries, and I have received more than my share of such assistance. To the librarians and archivists of St. Andrews University Library, the British Library, the Theological College of the Scottish Episcopal Church, Lambeth Palace Library, the National Library of Scotland, and New College, University of Edinburgh, I would like to express my thanks. More particularly, I would like to thank Joan Auld and her staff in the archives of Dundee University Library; Dr. Peter Doll of Pusey House Library; and Peter Vasey of the Scottish Record Office for patient and sustained help over many months. The General Secretary of General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church kindly allowed me unlimited access to their records, as did Provost Peter Sanderson of St. Paul's Cathedral, Dundee. The Very Revd. Robert Breaden and the parish of St. Mary's, Broughty Ferry, generously financed much of my time in Dundee for research purposes. Small research grants were also received from the Faculty of Divinity, University of Edinburgh; the General Synod Office, Scottish Episcopal Church; and the Bishop of Brechin. My greatest academic debt is to Professor Stewart J. Brown, my supervisor, who took a keen interest in my work and taught me much about the science and art of history. From his own extensive knowledge of the history of modern Britain and Ireland Professor Brown impressed upon me the importance of understanding the history of the Church in its wider social context. But my greatest obligation is to my wife, Toni, who freely gave up her career in Australia, agreed to sell all we possessed, and to come half-way across the world so her husband could satisfy his yearning to test himself in doctoral studies. For the past three years she has worked to support us and thus made this research possible.

ABSTRACT.

Alexander Forbes became the very first Tractarian bishop when he was consecrated Bishop of Brechin in the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1847. Consequently, he is an important historical figure in the history of the nineteenth-century Catholic revival and the Scottish Episcopal Church. Forbes was a leading example to many Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics in the Episcopal Church, and in the Church of England. He also became well-known to various Roman Catholic Churchmen in Europe through his work for Catholic reunion in the 1860's. As bishop and also incumbent of the Episcopalian congregation in the newly industrialized and urbanized Dundee, Forbes developed a Tractarian slum ministry unique among Anglican bishops in Britain. It was the influence of the Oxford Movement during the early 1840's that directed Forbes' social commitment towards the labouring poor, coupled with his inherited Tory paternalism. The Oxford Movement also imparted to Forbes a strong belief in the importance of dogmatic theology, which he believed to be a remedy for the Church against the religious doubt and secularism of the mid-Victorian period. In 1857, the Tractarian dogmatics of his primary charge initiated the eucharistic controversy within the Episcopal Church and divided Episcopalian High Churchmen and Tractarians. In 1860, failure to condemn Forbes at his heresy trial permitted Tractarianism to continue to be propagated within the Episcopal Church. Between 1862 and 1864, Forbes' leadership in his own Church was broadened by his campaign to retain the native Scottish Communion Office. By this campaign, Forbes opposed some of the major elements of anglicization in the Episcopal Church, and reunited Tractarians and northern Episcopal High Churchmen in defence of the Office. But the eucharistic controversy and the threat to the Scottish Communion Office made Forbes uncertain about the catholicity of Anglicanism, and during the 1860's he seriously considered converting to Roman Catholicism. The decree of papal infallibility in 1870 meant the failure of Forbes' efforts for Anglican-Roman Catholic reunion. However, this enabled him to cast aside the attractions of Roman Catholicism and revive his Tractarian commitment to the Anglican Church. But Forbes' entrenched beliefs were increasingly in conflict with the emerging democratic society of the 1870's. However, by the time of his death in 1875 Forbes' place as a leader and example to many sympathisers of the Catholic revival in Scotland and England had been cemented.

CONTENTS.

ABBREVIATIONS.

BL.	British Library.
BpF.	Bishop Forbes correspondence, Pusey House archives.
BrMs.	Brechin Diocesan archives, Dundee University.
DNB.	*Dictionary of National Biography.*
DCL.	Dundee Central Library.
DUL.	Dundee University Library archives.
EUML.	Edinburgh University Main Library archives,
IOR.	India Office Records, British Library.
Lathbury.	D.C.Lathbury, *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*, (1910).
KP.	Keble to Pusey correspondence, Pusey House archives.
LPL.	Lambeth Palace Library.
Mackey.	Donald Mackey, *Bishop Forbes a Memoir*, (1888).
NLS.	National Library of Scotland.
Perry.	W.Perry, *Alexander Penrose Forbes*, (1939).
PH.	Pusey House archives.
PK.	Pusey to Keble correspondence, Pusey House archives.
PP.	Pusey Papers, Pusey House archives.
REC.	Registers of Episcopal College, Scottish Episcopal Church.
RSCHS.	*Records of the Scottish Church History Society.*
SAUL.	St. Andrews University Library archives.
SEJ.	*Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal.*
SPC.	Records of St. Paul's Cathedral, Dundee.
SRO.	Scottish Record Office.

INTRODUCTION.

When Alexander Forbes was consecrated Bishop of Brechin in 1847 he was the first follower of the Oxford Movement to become a bishop. He had been a disciple of the Catholic revival in the Anglican Church since its earliest years - during the Oxford Movement proper, when it held sway at Oxford University between 1833 and 1845. He was also, as the first Tractarian bishop, a pre-eminent embodiment of the Catholic revival of the nineteenth century which saw in the Anglican episcopate a foundation for the authority of the Church independent of the state. As the first bishop to emerge from the ranks of the Catholic revival Forbes was regarded as an example and a leader to many of its followers, both in his own Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Church of England. Tractarian Churchmen in England had to wait until 1857 for a bishop of their own school, when Walter Hamilton was consecrated Bishop of Salisbury. As the first Tractarian bishop, Forbes therefore had a widespread influence not only within his own Church and in England, but also in European Roman Catholic circles through his work for Catholic reunion in the 1860's. Forbes was one of the few Anglican Churchmen ever to be tried for heresy, so that his heresy trial in 1860 provides a fundamental insight into the effect of the Catholic revival on the Episcopal Church. As a bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church, Forbes had to have charge of a congregation in order to have an income. His long and prominent ministry in Dundee during the mid-Victorian period put him at the heart of a city massively

changed by the industrialization and urbanization of Britain during the nineteeth century. Forbes was therefore one of the few Churchmen, virtually the only Scottish Episcopalian, and certainly the only Anglican bishop, exercising a slum ministry. This placed him at the cutting edge of the urban and industrial changes to nineteenth-century Scottish society.

Yet for all his widespread influence in his own day Alexander Forbes has been largely overlooked by historians. During the nineteenth century he was the subject of a number of Victorian memorials, the most extensive of which was that of Donald Mackey in 1888. [1] But none of these attempted more than a personal review of his life, and while important as sources they are inadequate as critical historical appraisals of Forbes. The only twentieth-century biography of Forbes was by William Perry in 1939. [2] But Perry was writing in the 1930's, the decade in which the centennial of the Oxford Movement (1933) was celebrated. It was a period when the Anglo-Catholic party predominated within British Anglicanism. Consequently, Perry believed Forbes' influence upon the Scottish Episcopal Church to be entirely benign. A high churchman himself, Perry was confident of the benefits of the Catholic revival and believed that the Tractarians were the revivifying heirs of the High Churchmen. This uncritical attitude to the impact of the Catholic revival on the Episcopal Church is open to question today. Perry's work also reveals a lack of understanding for Forbes' opponents who he regarded as obstructing the revival Forbes epitomised. He also failed to appreciate significant differences between the Tractarians and High Churchmen, asserting that the eighteenth-century nonjuring Episcopalians and their successors were "Tractarians long before the Tracts for the Times". [3] Forbes has rated a passing mention in some more general works of Oxford Movement or Scottish Church history, but the only other published historical works to draw attention to him have been two

recent articles. N.Gibb Pennie stressed Forbes' isolation among the Scottish bishops in supporting Tractarian teaching. [4] Christopher Knight's article on the anglicizing of the Scottish Episcopal Church maintained that the divisions within that Church were exacerbated by Forbes who, Knight implied, was one of the anglicizing influences. [5]

Not only is the historiography on Forbes meagre, but so is that on the Oxford Movement in Scotland and the Scottish Episcopal Church during the nineteenth century. Most of the research into the Oxford Movement in Britain has focused on the Church of England. This was inevitable given that the Catholic revival begun by the Movement originated there and, being the largest single Christian body in Britain during the nineteenth century, the revival had its widest ecclesiastical and social impact in England. But outwith the Church of England, Scotland was the first country the Catholic revival migrated to and where there had been for centuries an Episcopalian [the less Anglo-centric title for `Anglicans´ in Scotland] presence. Since the sixteenth century that tradition had been maintained within the Church of Scotland by royal government. Following the overthrowal of the Stuart James VII and II in 1688, Episcopalians were mostly unable to abjure their oaths of allegiance to the Stuart monarchy and became proscribed in Scotland as Nonjurors. This contributed to the triumph of Presbyterianism in the Church of Scotland, and the formation of a distinct Episcopal Church with a developing nonjuring High Church theology. What then happened when the Catholic revival initiated by the Oxford Movement encountered the Scottish Episcopal Church which, unlike the Church of England, was, by the nineteenth century, more uniformly High Church in its theology and outlook?

Virtually the only historian on the Oxford Movement in Scotland this century was William Perry, who wrote a small monograph on the subject, and biographies of Alexander Forbes and of his brother George, an Episcopalian priest and scholar. [6] The only monograph since Perry's was by Marion Lochhead, which includes a chapter on Forbes, but whose work inclines toward the hagiographical and anecdotal. [7] Aside from the articles already mentioned there are only two other published works on the Oxford Movement in Scotland. One is an essay published by A.Maclean in 1984 which deals with the changes wrought by the Catholic revival on Episcopalian worship during the past two centuries. [8] The other is an article by Gavin White on Episcopalian reaction to early Tractarianism. [9] The Scottish Episcopal Church during the nineteenth century has also attracted little recent historical research. In addition to the works cited above there are only two articles from the 1960's. [10]

Such a meagre modern historiography demonstrates the lack of research into the nineteenth-century Scottish Episcopal Church compared to its larger Anglican neighbour in England. To a large extent this is a consequence of that Church's small size in Scotland. But perhaps its comparative neglect also owes something to historians' preferences. A Church regarded by historians as largely upper class has not attracted the attention of contemporary historians of the nineteenth century who have been generally oriented towards working-class movements. But even a small, predominantly upper-class Church was influential in nineteenth-century Scottish society and deserves more attention than it has hitherto received. Nor did the Episcopal Church's aristocratic and landed connections mean it was without allegiance among the lower orders, even the very lowest, as Forbes' ministry indicates.

However, while social factors are very important in ecclesiastical history, E.R.Norman's caution about judging the Churches only by their social engagement needs to be heeded. In the nineteenth century, the social dimension of Church work was, for most Churchmen, only a consequence of what Norman calls their "pursuit of eternity". [11] It would be an anachronistic distortion to focus on Church ministry to the labouring poor in that century (or lack of it) without understanding that it was a consequence of Christian belief. In Forbes' case, this would be to highlight his ministry in the urban slums of Dundee without also giving priority to the major event of his ecclesiastical life - his being tried for doctrinal error. To understand nineteenth-century Churchmen, and Forbes especially, in their own terms, it is necessary to understand the importance they ascribed to doctrine and correct belief.

The most negative historical opinion on Bishop Forbes is that of Andrew Drummond and James Bulloch who consider his influence was confined to the Episcopal Church, having "no more effect on the average Scot than had Pusey, let us say, among English Methodists". [12] The most laudatory opinion is that of Perry who characterised Forbes as "the Scottish Pusey". The first begs the question about just who constituted "the average Scot", seeming to exclude Episcopalians by definition. The second, by equating Forbes with Edward Pusey in England, has given him far too much prominence within the Scottish nation. The truth may lie, as so often, between the two extremes. Forbes, as bishop and worker among the labouring poor, was neither so unknown to Scots as Drummond and Bulloch assert, nor so influential within Scotland as Perry believed. But among Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics, Forbes was certainly increasingly influential throughout the nineteenth century in both the Episcopal Church and the Church of England, as one of the most significant leaders of the Catholic revival.

An explanation is necessary regarding terminology. The term "high church" is used in two senses. When capitalised (High Church) it refers to that group of Churchmen, both in the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church, whose existence predated the Oxford Movement, and who continued as a distinct group both during and after it. These High Churchmen held to a Catholic theology deriving from English theologians of the seventeenth century, looked appreciatively upon the English Reformation, and regarded the Church of England and its parliamentary establishment as exemplary. There were, however, significant differences between High Churchmen in England and Scotland, the latter having a higher regard for the Nonjurors of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Where the term is used in the lower case (as in "high church" or "high") it is inclusive of High Churchmen proper, and also of Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics, that is, when all Catholic parties in either Church are referred to. A distinction is also made between the earliest group in the Catholic revival, and their successors. So "Tractarian" is used to describe those directly influenced by the Oxford Movement proper (that is, the Movement centred on Oxford University from 1833 to 1845). Tractarians were more interested in developing Catholic doctrine and teaching than in liturgical ritualism. Their younger successors, the "Anglo-Catholics", continued the revival after 1845 outside the university, in parishes and various organisations, predominantly through the promotion of Catholic ritual. To distinguish between these groups highlights the development of the Catholic revival and mitigates any tendency to regard the Catholic-minded in either Church as a monolithic or unified party.

NOTES.

1. Donald Mackey, *Bishop Forbes:a memoir*, (1888).
2. W.Perry, *Alexander Penrose Forbes:the Scottish Pusey*, (1939).
3. W.Perry, *The Oxford Movement in Scotland*, (1933), 37.
4. N.Gibb Pennie, "The Trial of the Rev. Patrick Cheyne for Erroneous Teaching of the Eucharist in Aberdeen in 1858", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xxiii, part 1, (1987), 77-93.
5. C.Knight, "The Anglicising of Scottish Episcopalianism", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xxiii, part 3, (1989), 361-377.
6. W.Perry, *George Hay Forbes:a Romance in Scholarship*, (1927).
7. M.Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*, (1966).
8. A.Maclean, "Episcopal Worship in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries", in *Studies in the History of Worship in Scotland*, ed., D.Forrester & D.Murray, (1984).
9. G.White, "New Names for Old Things: Scottish Reaction to Early Tractarianism", in D.Baker (ed.), *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*, (1977), 329-337.
10. R.Foskett, "The Episcopate of Daniel Sandford 1810-30", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xv, (1966), 141-152; & "The Drummond Controversy", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xvi, (1969), 99-109. There are also two theses on the nineteenth-century Episcopal Church, but these contain little original research. They are: D.W.T.Crooks, "The Effects of the Oxford Movement in the Scottish Episcopal Church in the Nineteenth Century", unpublished B.D. thesis, Trinity College, Dublin, 1983; and A.E.Nimmo, "Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews 1853-1892:Reconciler or Controversialist", unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1983.
11. E.R.Norman, *Church and Society in England 1770-1970*, (1976), 5.
12. A.Drummond & J.Bulloch, *The Church in Victorian Scotland 1843-1874*, (1975), 212.

1

EDINBURGH AND INDIA.

The son of a successful lawyer usually has pleasant prospects, and when Alexander Forbes was born in 1817 his father was close to reaching the highest strata of the Scottish legal profession. John Hay Forbes was already a successful and well-connected advocate in Edinburgh, a city dominated by its legal elite. His appointment in 1825 to the bench of the Court of Session, the highest court in the land, took him to the very top of this dominant group in the city's society. He marked this in the usual way for established Edinburgh lawyers - by buying an estate, at Medwyn in Peebleshire and took his legal title from his new lands. Lord Medwyn's aristocratic upbringing and the prevailing values of the urban elite taught him that landed property was still the surest foundation for an influential family. The Edinburgh legal elite mingled on equal terms with the landed gentry and aristocracy, so John Forbes' aspirations were not unusual for his profession. But his success in his profession was assisted by the fortune previously secured by his father, Sir William Forbes.

Their branch of the Forbes' had been an old Aberdeenshire family whose fortunes had declined in the mid eighteenth century. Sir William's grandfather had sold the family estate of Monymusk and his son had earned his living as an advocate. William Forbes' mother had moved to Edinburgh in 1753, after the death

of her husband, and apprenticed William to the banking firm of John Coutts. [1] He was obviously suited to the commercial world for in 1763 when another banking firm was established, on the death of John Coutts, William became one of the partners. The firm of Forbes and Company remained a leading Edinburgh banking firm and in 1838 became the Union Bank. Sir William Forbes had a strong attachment to his adopted city. He was very active in city charities, including the Charity Workhouse [2]; was prominent in the rebuilding of the Royal High School, and was a member of the Society of Antiquaries. [3] He cultivated the literary society of Edinburgh and was a frequent visitor to London, "being partial to its society". [4]

Sir William Forbes' rise to prosperity enabled him to restore the family to the status of landed gentry, through his purchase of the old family estate of Pitsligo. This had previously belonged to the family of his maternal grandmother whose sister had married Alexander, fourth Lord of Pitsligo. A Jacobite, Pitsligo's estates had been confiscated after the failure of the rising of 1715 when he had come out for the Chevalier, James Stuart. After some years of exile in France, where he maintained his Episcopalianism at the Roman Catholic court of the Chevalier, Pitsligo eventually returned to Scotland only to join the Jacobite's rising of 1745 as a cavalry commander in Prince Charles Edward Stuart's army. Following the defeat at Culloden he remained hidden in his native Aberdeenshire and ended his days living incognito in his son's house. [5] After the death of Pitsligo's son, William succeeded to the baronetcy. William expressed his attachment to his Jacobite ancestor and to the revival of his family's wealth and position when he purchased the arms and title of the old Jacobite baron, becoming Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo, baronet. The estate and armigerous title also secured his position among the old landed aristocracy of Scotland. As the late nineteenth-century

biographer, Thomas Thomson, observed, William Forbes was "a link between the old Scottish aristocratic families, to which he belonged by birth, and the rising commercial opulence with which he was connected by profession". [6]

Sir William Forbes's second son, John Hay Forbes, was born in 1776. He entered the legal profession and by 1806 was the Sheriff-Depute of the county of Perth. [7] As a Tory judge of the Court of Session, Lord Medwyn earned the respect of the Whig, Henry Cockburn, with whom he shared the bench. Cockburn remembered John Forbes as:

> more of a monk in matters of religion or politics than any man I know, is an excellent, judicious, humane, practical judge, with great integrity, and a deep sense of official duty. Though pious, and acquainted, by long administration of the affairs of both the innocent and the guilty poor, with the feelings of the lower orders when in distress, he agrees with me the uselessness, if not the hurtfulness, of the judge preaching to every prisoner who is undergoing sentence. [8]

As a judge Medwyn was one of the majority on the bench of the Court of Session which decided in the Auchterarder Case in 1838 that the Church of Scotland's Veto Act of 1834 was illegal. [9] By upholding the rights of patrons to present candidates to the livings of the Church of Scotland and rejecting the rights of local congregations to veto presentees, this decision contributed directly to the Disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843. But Medwyn's legal opinions did not always favour established privilege. In the trial of some cotton spinners in January 1838, Cockburn observed that Medwyn gave judicial lectures about the criminality of "compelling trade-unionism by violence while acknowledging the judicial innocence of mere combination." [10]

William Forbes' had firm connections with the Tory government. He was consulted over finance and declined a number of invitations to stand for Parliament.

[11] As Scotland was governed by the Tories of the landed classes until the Reform Act of 1832 his banking interests would have steered him towards the ruling interest, even if his family background had not. William Forbes' influence with the ruling Tories no doubt assisted the appointment of his son John to the Court of Session. As Cockburn relates in his *Memorials*, such an appointment would only have gone, in the years before 1832, to someone disposed toward the Tory interest. His decision in the Auchterarder case to find in favour of the rights of patronage shows Medwyn strongly sympathetic to the interest of the landed classes which was the basis of Tory power and influence.

The city Alexander was born into was just coming to the end of its cultural golden age in the years of the Scottish enlightenment. European figures such as David Hume, Adam Smith, Robert Adam and William Robertson were already dead. Dugald Stewart, professor of moral philosophy at Edinburgh University, and the last leader of these eighteenth-century literati, would die in 1828. But the most lasting legacy of the classical culture of eighteenth-century Edinburgh was the building of the new town after 1767. For the remainder of the eighteenth century the middle and upper classes migrated wholesale to this part of the city with its wide, straight streets, Georgian crescents and houses of classical facades. They left to the lower orders the wynds and tenements of the old town. But the break between the two was never complete, for such necessary institutions as the law courts, council chambers and the Royal High School remained in the old town. At Alexander's birth the Forbes' lived in York Place in the new town and a few years later moved to 17 Ainslie Place, one of the more fashionable crescents in the west end. Edinburgh gave some indications of being a city moving confidently into the nineteenth century, despite the economic recession in Britain following the end of the Napoleonic wars in 1815. The Union Canal between Edinburgh and Glasgow

was begun in 1818 and opened in 1822. [12] The number of stagecoaches to London rose to fourteen a week by 1820. [13] More indicative of the industrialized society to come was the start in 1821 of a steam-packet service between London and Leith; the formation in 1819 of joint-stock company to supply water to Edinburgh. [14] In 1822 the main thoroughfare of Princes Street was gas-lit. [15]

The end of the Napoleonic wars also drew to a close a period of sweeping change for the society of the city. Previously the social orders had intermingled in the old town, competing for the centre of the street to avoid the dung or the chamber pot thrown from an upper window in a manner hardly different from their medieval predecessors. The lower middle orders and the nobility even shared different floors of the same tenement. The building of the new town not only expressed the greater confidence of the middle orders, who were to be the most successful class in the nineteenth century, but also the hardening of nineteenth century society into separate economic and social classes with increasingly different values and aspirations. Henry Cockburn captures this feeling of change:

> The more immediate changes in Edinburgh proceeded chiefly from the growth of the city.* The single circumstance of the increase of population, and its consequent overflowing from the old town to the new, implied a general alteration of our habits. It altered the style of living, obliterated local arrangements, and destroyed a thousand associations, which nothing but the still preserved names of houses and of places is left to recal[sic]. It was the rise of the new town that obliterated our old peculiarities with the greatest rapidity and effect. [16]

* The population of Edinburgh grew from approximately 36,000 in 1755 (exclusive of the parish of St. Cuthbert's and of Leith) to 59,000 in the 1831 census. [T.C.Smout, *A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830*, (1972), 343.]

Alexander Penrose Forbes was born into this changing city on 6 June 1817. [17] He was the second son of the family and had three brothers and seven sisters, although a brother and three sisters died in childhood. [18] His mother Louisa, the daughter of Sir Alexander Cumming-Gordon of Altyre, in Morayshire, had married John Forbes in 1802. The Cumming-Gordons' hereditary barony went back to the fifteenth century and Alexander was given the name Penrose after an old family name on his mother's side. They remained influential enough in the nineteenth century for his mother's father and eldest brother to be Tory members of Parliament, for Inverness and Elgin respectively. [19]

Alexander was baptised one month later on 9 July at St. Paul's Chapel in York Place where his parents were members of the congregation. [20] This chapel began to be built in 1815 and its congregation finally moved into it from the Cowgate Chapel in 1818. [21] St. John's, in the west end of Princes Street, where Medwyn's older brother William was a respected member of the congregation, was also built at the same time. [22] The erection of such prominent buildings illustrated a new confidence in the Episcopalians of Edinburgh, as Cockburn comments:

> Our episcopalians used to be so few that their two principal congregations met, the one in a humble place at the west end of Rose Street, the other in a chapel which, though handsome and spacious when got at, was buried in an inaccessible close on the south side of the Cannongate. Indeed it was only within a few years before this sect had got some of the legal vexations which had clouded it removed. They now raised their heads; and growing in numbers, and in aristocracy, erected their new chapels at the west end of Princes Street, and at the east end of York Place. [23]

As well as these two increasingly prosperous and respected congregations there was also a small, former-nonjuring congregation, which met in Carrubber's Close on the north side of the High Street.

Alexander was brought up a devout member of the Scottish Episcopal Church, deriving his devotion to Episcopalianism from his father and grandfather, who were both leading figures in the Episcopal Church in their generation. His grandfather combined his membership of a Episcopalian congregation which conformed to the reigning Hanoverians with an attachment to the former Stuart dynasty. In 1793 he undertook a belated grand tour of Europe for the sake of his wife's health. While in Rome he spent time with a friend of Cardinal Henry Stuart, the younger brother of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, who since the latter's death in 1788 was the Stuart claimant to the British throne. Forbes wrote in his journal, "it is impossible for me, nor indeed do I wish, to divest myself of a partiality, for the Count of Albany [Cardinal Henry Stuart] & his ill-fated house". [24] Forbes availed himself of the chance of seeing the cardinal himself by going to St. Peter's basilica to observe him saying mass, but was too embarassed to accept an invitation to be introduced as he was uncertain how to address the royal cardinal. His dilemma as recorded in his journal reveals both his disposition to be generous towards the cardinal's royal lineage and his Scottish nationalism. He considered to address him as "his eminence" would be:

> short of what I considered him to be entitled to as the Grandson of King James the Second. *Royal Highness*, which, in politeness & courtesy at least, I should have thought due to him; as his Father had been recognised as king by the Pope, & by Louis the Fourteenth; would have done well enough when his Elder Brother was alive; but which he would probably have considered too little now that he had assumed the title & style of *Henry the nineth*...and to have called him *His Majesty*, I could not think altogether proper on my part who owed allegiance to the reigning Family of Britain...thus [I] lost the only opportunity I shall probably ever have of being in the Company of the last male descendant of our Antient Scottish kings for whom I do not conceal my having a strong & partial veneration. [25]

He later regretted his decision as the cardinal might have been able to tell him something of his "near relation" the Jacobite Lord Alexander of Pitsligo. [26] Romantic affections for his family's Jacobite past may also have been the reason for Medwyn later editing Lord Pitsligo's book, complete with a very sympathetic

biography as its introduction. [27]

These thoughts of Sir William Forbes would have surprised the good burghers of Edinburgh for whom he was a solid member of the establishment of the city with its secure allegiance, at least since 1746, to the Hanoverians. But such thoughts would have been far less surprising to Forbes' fellow Episcopalians who, for most of the eighteenth century, were identified and periodically persecuted for their Jacobite loyalty to the defeated and exiled house of Stuart. William Forbes' sympathy towards the Jacobite cause however, contrasts with his practical decision to accept the Hanoverian dynasty. This contrast typifies an issue among Scottish Episcopalians that was responsible for their divisions in the eighteenth century, divisions that continued, despite formal union, into the nineteenth century.

Episcopalians were primarily motivated by Jacobitism from 1689 until at least until 1715. [28] Yet while the majority of Episcopalians were unable to take the oaths to William and Mary in 1689, there were a number who were willing to conform and these formed an increasingly separate and isolated group in the course of the eighteenth century. These conformists were always a minority and never included any of the Scottish bishops. Initially after 1689 they were penalised by those zealous for presbytery but were gradually able to take advantage of the lenient attitude of the monarchs. In 1712 an Act of Parliament gave legal toleration to those Episcopal ministers who would take the oaths to Queen Anne and pray for her and the Princess Sophia of Hanover by name in public worship. [29] From 1712 therefore this conformist group of Episcopalians "qualified" for toleration. After the 1715 Jacobite rising, as the fever of the rebellion died down and they began to enjoy the fruits of tolerance, this group grew less political and became increasingly anglicized, more especially after the penal acts of 1719. This led to

several Episcopal congregations appointing clergy who were willing to take the oaths to the Hanoverians and thus to qualify for toleration. As all the Scottish bishops were nonjuring, these conforming congregations were supplied by clergy ordained in England or the Church of Ireland. Anglicization of the qualified clergy increased after the 1745 rebellion when the penal acts decreed that only Episcopal ministers ordained in England and Ireland could be recognised in law. As only five nonjuring clergy qualified at that time, and two of these later repented of their action, obviously the source of Scottish clergymen for the qualified congregations had run dry. [30] This anglicization was further accentuated by the arrival into the south of Scotland of English immigrants who employed the English *Book of Common Prayer* for worship. Throughout the eighteenth century Episcopalians in the south of Scotland became increasingly anglicized and cut-off from their nonjuring brethren. This led to a disparity of outlook which remained and intensified through the last half of the eighteenth century.

For the nonjuring majority, it was because of the binding nature of their oath of allegiance to the Stuarts that they lost the battle for a legally established episcopacy in 1688-89. In 1705 the bishops agreed to continue the episcopal succession and consecrate bishops without title or jurisdiction to a diocese but only as members of the "episcopal college", so as not to infringe upon the right of their acknowledged sovereign to nominate to dioceses. [31] In all matters, including internal church government, the bishops in 1705 considered themselves answerable to their sovereign.

However, the Jacobite allegiance of the Episcopal Church became increasingly conditional in the period after 1715. It is not that they stopped being Jacobite but that gradually, at least for the bishops, their identity as Episcopalians was more

and more established upon uniquely theological foundations. So when Jacobitism at last ceased to be any sort of viable option after 1788, Scottish Episcopalianism continued as a Church because its identity had been gradually founded on distinctive theological and liturgical principles.

The influence of the Chevalier (the Stuart claimant to the British throne) with the bishops began to weaken after 1720 and gradually episcopal independence began to be asserted. This process can be seen particularly in the middle of the century, and was associated with Bishops James Gadderar and Thomas Rattray and their support for diocesan episcopacy and the Scottish liturgy. Gadderar and Rattray both had similar and firm views, desiring the re-establishment of a diocesan episcopacy and the use of the Scottish liturgy based on the Scottish prayer book of 1637. In their struggle for these principles they were prepared to consider opposing the continuation of the royal prerogative in the Scottish Episcopal Church. But prior to the 1740's they were resisted in this desire by the majority of the other bishops. These latter bishops were known as the "college party" and they wanted the Church to be governed non-territorially by a college of bishops nominated by their king.

Both Gadderar and Rattray lived for a time in London and had extensive contact with the English Nonjurors while there. [32] English Nonjurors had more leisure and freedom to pursue scholarship than was possible to those in Scotland and contact with this scholarship south of the border influenced these two Scottish bishops. Largely through an interest and regard for the authority of the early Church the Nonjurors in England formulated high theologies of the spiritual independence of the Church from the state. They believed this independence was enshrined and preserved in the apostolic succession of the episcopate and needed to

be expressed through a richer, more catholic liturgy than the contemporary English *Book of Common Prayer*. [33] It is not surprising that these two Scots, given their years of contact with the English Nonjurors, should be protagonists for those things in their own Church which represented the theology they had come to value in the south, even if these things were moribund, like the Scottish liturgy, or antagonistic to their Jacobitism, like their claim to diocesan episcopacy against the wishes of the Chevalier. Gadderar for example, republished and annotated some hundred copies of the Scottish Communion Office of 1637 for use in his diocese. This annotated version was in turn further published without his knowledge and became extremely popular. [34] John Dowden in his study of the Scottish Communion Office considered that it was the Scottish liturgy "of the family type" of Gadderar's that formed the basis of the most widespread use in the Episcopal Church during the eighteenth century. [35] Rattray also did a great deal to promote the Scottish liturgy. John Dowden, the Episcopalian liturgist, claimed that Rattray was in fact primarily responsible for the most characteristic features of the Scottish Communion Office in its most authoritative form of 1764. [36] It was this liturgy that was to become a major source of controversy and division within the Episcopal Church during the nineteenth century, climaxing during the episcopate of Alexander Forbes.

The major area of conflict between the two groups of nonjuring Episcopalians in the eighteenth century, however, was the re-establishment of diocesan episcopacy. In May 1727 the Edinburgh clergy met and elected Bishop Millar - a "college" bishop - specifically as their diocesan. He was acknowledged by Gadderar and one other bishop but by none of the rest. In the same year Rattray was chosen as Bishop of Brechin, another diocesan election. The theological claim of Gadderar and Rattray for diocesan episcopacy was gradually growing in popularity among Episcopal clergy and laity until it was driving the bishops into two camps.

As if action was not enough Rattray also upheld in his writings the cause of diocesan episcopacy and the spiritual independence of the Church. In 1728 he wrote *An Essay on the Nature of the Church* which was essentially an argument for an independent, authoritative episcopate drawn from the authority of the Church Fathers. He was applying the theological lessons learnt from the English Nonjurors. Among the claims he made in that essay for the episcopate are for monarchical, diocesan bishops as of the *esse* of the Church. [37] The communion between the bishops and the diocese or "particular Church" constituted the unity of the Church. [38] Each diocesan bishop was independent because he has no higher "Principle of Unity" above him, being himself immediately subordinate to Christ. [39] Only Christ may judge a bishop. [40] From an argument that the Catholic or universal Church was comprised of bishops who ratify one another's deeds [41] Rattray drew the conclusions that - first, the consent of all bishops in one province was needed for a canon law [42]; that only a diocesan bishop can have the authority of oversight to govern at a provincial level [43]; and that a national Church without dioceses was thus contrary not only to the original purpose of episcopacy but also to the "design of God". [44]

While this was clearly written primarily to oppose theologically the "college party" among the bishops, it is also obvious that the nature of the Church for Rattray had little or no place for the royal supremacy. Having asserted the independence of the Church Rattray went on to question the need for royal authority within it. He believed that the old form of episcopal election by royal nomination "cannot take place in our present circumstances, when the Church must act upon her own original and inherent rights. " [45] First of these inherent rights was the appointment of her own governors, the bishops. Not content with this dismissal of the royal supremacy Rattray went on to make the claim that the only reason for

the Church's submission to civil authority previously was its recognition of the temporal advantages the latter could bestow; but when that civil protection fails the Church is bound to assert inherent rights again for her own survival in difficult times. [46] There could hardly be a more assertive theology of episcopacy as an inherent spiritual authority of the Church, while the royal authority was reduced to a matter of convenience in good times and an irrelevancy in bad.

By the late 1720's the influence within Scottish Episcopacy lay increasingly with men of the mind of Rattray and Gaddderar to the detriment of those upholding the prerogatives of the "king over the water". However, both parties were augmenting their numbers by new consecrations. The beginning of the end of this rupture among the bishops, and another step towards victory for the diocesan ideal came with an agreement of the two sides in 1731 which produced a concordat subscribed to by all the bishops. They agreed to the following articles:

> 1. That we shall only make use of the Scottish or English Liturgy in the public divine service, nor shall we disturb the peace of the Church by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient Usages*, concerning which there has been lately a difference among us; and that we shall censure any of our clergy who act otherwise.
> 2. That hereafter no man shall be consecrated a Bishop of this Church without the consent and approval of the majority of the other Bishops.
> 3. That upon the demise or removal elsewhere of a Bishop of any district, the presbyters thereof shall neither elect, nor entrust to, another Bishop, without a mandate from the Primus, by consent of the other Bishops.
> 4. That the Bishops of this Church shall, by a majority of voices, choose their Primus, for convocating and presiding only, and that no Bishop shall claim jurisdiction without the bounds of his own district.

Districts corresponding to the former dioceses were then allocated to all the bishops with the rider that "by the aforesaid divisions of districts we do not pretend to claim any legal title to dioceses". [47]

* These were principally the mixing of water with the wine at the eucharist; prayer for the dead; the *epiclesis* or invocation of the Holy Spirit over the eucharistic elements; the prayer of oblation.

This of course was a compromise. It did not end the tension completely. Nor did the diocesan party get all they wanted. Dioceses were claimed only under the provisional description of "districts" with no legal title, and the agreement was still sent to the Chevalier. But it was sent as something already decided and its provisions made no mention of his prerogative. The bishops were now diocesans in all but name. The diocesan party grew in influence in the bishops' meetings that followed. Gadderar died in February 1733 but his vision continued under Rattray's leadership and he became primus, or senior bishop, in 1739. Although he died shortly before the Episcopal Synod of 1743 which saw the triumph of the diocesan party's principles, Rattray had in fact already drawn up the first ten canons which, in addition to those of 1731, were then ratified. [48] These increased the almost-diocesan authority of the bishop. No priest, for example, could move from his district without dismissal of his bishop. The canons affirmed the use of the Scottish liturgy as well as the English, with a strong recommendation for the former. [49] One of the canons also encouraged that attention to the authority of the early Church which had been so formative for the English Non-jurors. The clergy were encouraged not only to study scripture but also "the Fathers of the apostolical and two next succeeding ages and...to instruct their people in the truly Catholic principles of that pure and primitive Church". [50] This was a recommendation which could only bolster support for the authority of the early Church among Scottish Episcopalian clergy. In their other ideals the diocesan party gained a victory over the old seventeenth-century theology of royal supremacy, passive obedience and non-resistance represented by the college party and the trustees of the Chevalier. More importantly for the future of the nonjuring Church they had, whether they fully realised it or not, fundamentally weakened the theological basis of Jacobitism.

Perhaps the bishops did realise this to some extent, which may account for their lack of support for the 1745 rebellion. Only two Episcopal clergy actually followed the Prince's army and both were tried and executed. [51] A future bishop, Robert Forbes, had certainly intended to do so but had been apprehended on the way. [52] But there appears to be no record of the bishops giving overt support to the Jacobite army or to the Prince, whereas in 1715 the Episcopalians, including the bishops, had supported that uprising as a Church. [53] In 1745 they had an even better opportunity to offer the same support. The Prince's army this time had defeated its first opponents and entered Edinburgh. The outlook was certainly more hopeful than at the time of the Episcopalian loyal address in 1715 when the Jacobite army was already in retreat. Perhaps it was their reduced fortunes that produced the lack of response in 1745. Certainly since 1715 the Episcopal clergy were much diminished in numbers. It has been estimated that there were no more than a hundred and thirty priests in communion with the Scottish bishops at this time. [54] The long years of persecution and uncertainty had taken a toll and probably engendered a spirit of caution into the reduced body of the faithful. Yet if ever there was hope for their long allegiance to the Stuarts it was surely in those days in Edinburgh after the Jacobite victory at Prestonpans, when others were not afraid, or considered it expedient, to wave a white cockade.

After the 45's spirit had been defeated and savagely repressed the theological and liturgical values of Gadderar and Rattray continued dominant within the Episcopal Church. The independence and power of the bishops had already been established in the Episcopal Synod of 1743. The Scottish Liturgy had also been reprinted in 1743 and was used in those congregations which did not follow the English book, so that by 1764 an edition of the Scottish Communion Office could be published which became the recognised standard of this much varied liturgy.

[55] By 1764, according to Dowden, the Scottish Communion Office was "rapidly and generally accepted throughout the whole Church". [56]

The 1740's were therefore a pivotal decade in the emerging theology of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Prior to this most of the bishops had supported the old theological-political nexus of the seventeenth century, comprising the royal supremacy over the Church based on the divine right of kings, passive obedience and non-resistance. It was a theological and political matrix which had kept Episcopalians conscientiously obedient to their oaths to James VII in 1689. However, by 1743 some of the bishops were beginning to come to grips with the implications of a Church which was disestablished, periodically persecuted for its Jacobitism and, at times, for its episcopacy; and whose royal master was not only physically and religiously distant from its life, but after 1745 looked increasingly unlikely to be restored. Especially under the influence of Gadderar and Rattray the inherent spiritual life and authority of the Episcopalians as a Church (indeed, to them still *the* Church of Scotland) was being argued for. It was argued for at times, as in Rattray's treatise on the Church, in ways that could only raise doubts about the old monarchical theology. When the college party bishops argued and fought against the theology of these men they did so authentically representing that old seventeenth century understanding of the Church. But the future belonged to the theology of the diocesan party. It was not that the eighteenth-century nonjuring Episcopalians ceased to be Jacobite. After all, it was only when Prince Charles died leaving a totally unacceptable successor (a Roman Catholic cardinal) that they formally renounced their allegiance to the Stuarts, and not before. But the theological basis of such allegiance was undermined in the 1740's. In its place came a viable tradition - of the inherent spiritual independence of the Church as represented in diocesan episcopacy, liturgical worship, and the authority of the early Church. This

new theological basis for the nonjuring Episcopalians was increasingly consciously held in the later eighteenth century and made it possible for them to continue as a Church after 1788 when Jacobitism and the Stuarts were at last renounced and the auld song was ended.

After the formal declaration of allegiance to the Hanoverian dynasty in 1788, signified in a loyal address and the inclusion of the new sovereign and his family in public prayer [57], the Episcopal Church was eventually granted legal recognition and toleration in 1792. [58] The most urgent remaining business for the Church was the reunion of the qualified congregations with those (formerly nonjuring) giving allegiance to the Scottish bishops. Qualified congregations had been separated since 1715, during which time a number of new ones had been established, particularly in the south of Scotland. These had known neither the authority of the Scottish bishops nor the Scottish Communion Office. But the poor Scottish Episcopal Church was not well equipped to propose such a union with qualified congregations which had grown respectable and prosperous during a century of toleration and which looked south to the Church of England for legitimacy. By 1792 the Episcopal Church was a tiny successor to the Episcopalians of 1689, and the Scottish bishops were mostly elderly, the exception being John Skinner of Aberdeen. As bishop of the most Episcopally-populous diocese he was the leading influence working for union. In 1800 he wrote a revealing letter answering a query about the state of the Episcopal Church. Skinner thought there were about eleven thousand adult members of the Church who regularly attended its services, and about four thousand in the qualified congregations. These two parties of Episcopalians were found primarily in Edinburgh, Aberdeenshire, the Mearns and Angus, but there were other scattered congregations in Moray and Ross, and the highlands of Perth and Argyllshire. There were six bishops and fifty ministers whose stipends came

from pew-rents and collections at services. Skinner numbered the qualified clergy at twenty three, supported in the same way as the clergy of the Episcopal Church, but these were usually engaged for a stipulated time "having no superior Authority by which they are collated or tyed[sic] to their several Charges". [59]

As primus since 1788 Skinner was in a good position to be reasonably accurate in his estimates. Contrary to one estimate that the numbers of qualified and former nonjuring Episcopalians were approximately equal, Skinner considered the latter to be just over twice the number of the former. [60] As his estimate was only that of adults, the difference may have been even greater as the poorer north, where the qualified Episcopalians were fewer, had larger families than the richer south. In Bishop Macfarlane at Inverness, responsible for the diocese of Moray and Ross, including Argyll and the Isles, the formerly nonjuring Church possessed its only Gaelic speaker among the bishops. With his dedication to Episcopalian union Skinner did not specify which group was stronger in which locality, but presumably the qualified congregations were stronger in Edinburgh and the old nonjurors in Aberdeen, Angus and the Mearns. The other qualified congregations were all in the south and eastern lowlands. There were small congregations of Scottish Episcopalians in the highlands but, by that time they were very few. The Church was poor, with only a single endowed congregation. All the bishops needed to have congregational charges in order to draw an income. Skinner was hopeful of acquiring a government subsidy to alleviate this poverty and this made union all the more necessary as the most wealthy and politically influential Episcopalians, men like William Forbes, were necessarily members of qualified congregations.

The division between qualified and former nonjuring congregations was exacerbated by other differences of theology and geography. The north held firmly to the principles of the nonjuring eighteenth century. The south was more open to influences from England, strengthened by the presence of English clergy. The northern tradition of an independent diocesan episcopate based on a theology which exalted the power and status of the episcopate had resulted in almost unilateral control of the Church by the bishops. These alone could meet in synod and make the canons by which the life of the Church was regulated and organised. This control was suited to a small Church subject to periodic harassment during the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth however it would become increasingly ill-suited to a growing Church and would lead to tensions over the involvement in church government of the clergy and later by the laity. However the unchecked power of the bishop in the early nineteenth century did assist Bishop Skinner's efforts for union with the qualified chapels.

Sir William Forbes was a major influence supporting the plans of Bishop Skinner for union. He was well qualified to do so for he had direct, personal links with both groups of Episcopalians. A prominent man in the city, if Forbes was to practice his Episcopalianism openly he had no choice other than to become a member of a qualified congregation. Forbes evidently did not in principle frown upon the nonjuring Episcopalians, as he was a financial supporter of Bishop Alexander Jolly of Moray. [61] Sir William Forbes put his sympathy for both Episcopal groups into action when he fully supported Skinner's moves for their union. In 1803 the former nonjuring and the qualified congregations of Peterhead united. Forbes visited the minister of the former qualified congregation and asked if he might take with him to Edinburgh the written arguments the minister had used to convince his congregation of the move. [62] Forbes also dissuaded Bishop

Skinner from affixing a preamble to the English Thirty Nine Articles of Religion refuting the Calvinism of some Articles which Skinner felt was necessary to make subscription to the Articles acceptable to the Scottish clergy. [63] At a convocation of bishops and clergy called by Skinner on 24 October 1804, the Articles of Religion were subscribed to, as the 1792 Repeal Act and any hope of union had required. Sir William's Cowgate congregation was one of the first to unite with the Scottish Episcopal Church, although they continued to use the English *Book of Common Prayer*. [64]

After Sir William's death his sons continued his devotion to the Episcopal Church, Lord Medwyn especially being a supporter of the old nonjuring tradition exemplified in its bishops and the Scottish Communion Office. When he was in Perth as Sherriff he did in fact attend the qualified congregation that at that time remained outside the Scottish Episcopal Church. But there was no other Episcopal congregation in the town at the time and he had occasion to write later to Bishop Torry supporting the congregation's moves towards a union with the Episcopal Church affirming, "your Reverence will not doubt that I lamented deeply its remaining disunited from the Episcopal Church in this Country". [65] Torry indeed could not doubt it because Medwyn's support for the Episcopal Church spoke for itself. His support for the Scottish bishops was formalised in his leadership in establishing the Scots Episcopal Fund in 1838, later the Episcopal Church Society, to provide for the stipends of the bishops and other needs. [66] As well as a generous donor to various Episcopal causes, Medwyn was prominent in working towards healing the Drummond Schism, writing pamphlets supporting the claims of the Episcopal Church against so-called chapels of the "Church of England in Scotland". These congregations acknowledged no authority of the Scottish bishops and professed to come under the Church of England although none of the English

bishops claimed them. They were essentially independent congregations using the English Book of Common Prayer and led by clergy ordained in England or Ireland who felt antagonistic to the rite and theology of the Scottish Communion Office because of their Evangelicalism. Medwyn argued that the Scottish Episcopal Church was the true episcopal Church of Scotland, going back to the Reformation, and therefore it behoved Episcopalians in Scotland to be in communion with it. He defended the Scottish Communion Office, contending it was not a heretical liturgy savouring of Roman Catholicism. He regarded the former qualified chapels of the eighteenth century as "a very crippled episcopacy, if it even were entitled to that character at all" it were only because of prevailing political circumstances. [67] The nonjuring bishops he argued may have had their temporal advantages removed but the state "could not take away their clerical character...for the Bishops...neither did have, nor thought they lost, any portion of their spiritual office". [68] On the other distinguishing mark of the old nonjuring tradition, Medwyn wrote that he "greatly admired" the Scottish Communion Office.

> It is not, surely, a blind admiration, for in my early life I was not so privile ged as to attend a place of worship where this form was used; but I think it preferable to that in the English Book of Common Prayer, chiefly for two reasons: 1st, That it approaches much more nearly to the form in the earliest liturgies of the Christian Church which have come down to us, and, 2ndly, That it is also more distinctly opposed to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as well as to the Purgatory of the Romish Church. [69]

Medwyn also commented upon the influence of anglicization beginning to be felt within the Episcopal Church:

> it has unquestionably occured that the love of uniformity, and the use of the English form by the chief congregations in our principal cities in the south of Scotland, has given the tone to other places, so as to have made our National Office less respected, less esteemed, than it was prior to the union of the English congregations. [70]

So Alexander, as the grandson of a pre-eminent banker and the son of a Lord of Justiciary, was by birth a member of an old aristocratic family in a new

urban situation. A child of aristocratic Tories, he inherited ancestral links to the landed gentry and the aristocracy of Scotland but also with the rising capitalist classes of the industrial revolution through the banking interest of his grandfather. He was the son of a devout Christian family strongly attached to the Scottish Episcopal Church and to its nonjuring tradition, despite social circumstances which associated them with the qualified and anglicized Episcopal congregations.

Alexander learned his Christian faith at St. Paul's, York Place, but this teaching was no doubt complemented by the influence of his father and grandfather. In this way he was exposed to both the nonjuring and qualified traditions within Scottish Episcopacy. St. Paul's, in keeping with its former life as a qualified chapel, was an anglicized congregation, using the English *Book of Common Prayer* and predominantly middle and upper class.

In 1825 Alexander began his schooling at the new Edinburgh Academy. A check with the *Register of Edinburgh Academy* reveals that Forbes attended there from 1825 to 1832. [71] The Academy opened in October 1825, having been founded by a group of leading Edinburgh men who believed that the Royal High School, under the control of the town council, was not providing the sort of English classical education they wanted. The school, therefore, was a force for anglicization in the city and a break with the more democratic ethos of Scottish education, as even the sympathetic historian of the school acknowledges. [72] The new rector of the school was Archdeacon Williams, an accomplished Oxford-educated classicist. [73] Made rector of Edinburgh Academy in 1824, he stayed, almost continuously, until 1847. [74] The school's historian describes him as "firm for standards of study and scholarship...He was unquestionably in command from the very beginning: confident, imperious even, utterly dogmatic when it came

to the matter of his beloved classics". [75] Forbes' school days were accordingly devoted mostly to learning the classical languages of Greek and Latin. [76] Controversy arose over the Academy's English pronunciation of Latin as compared with Scottish and European usage, but Williams persisted in forming the school as much as possible along the lines of the English public school.

The school suited Alexander. In 1831, in his sixth class Alexander was listed fourteenth. [77] He was not mentioned among the seventh class honours in the following year. [78] His rector's report says that every year but one he was on the prize list. "That during the whole of the period he conducted himself with due attention to his studies and to the rules of discipline established at the institution." The rector also reported Forbes' "great quickness of perception, and that were he to add to his natural powers perseverance in study much might be expected of him, that his scholarship is very fair, and that both in feeling and manners he is most gentlemanly." [79] The aims of the school were evidently fulfilled in Alexander. He was a good scholar. This, in the opinion of a rector "dogmatic" about the classics, meant primarily that he had a firm grasp of the logic and principles of the classical languages. Alexander was a bright boy, yet looking perhaps at his seventh class results, the rector felt he lacked perseverance and relied too much on his natural talent. He was amenable to discipline and authority, and Archdeacon Williams' remark on Alexander's courtesy was a sign of the personal charm that many others later remarked on. Above all Alexander's education exposed him to greater English influence than either his father or grandfather had experienced in their schooling. It prepared him for a place in a wider world than theirs - for higher education in England, in the civil service at home or in the growing needs of the empire. It did this at the expense of his attachment to much of what was distinctive in Scottish life, such as that of his

grandfather to Edinburgh society or that of his father to Scots law. Alexander's early education made him more British than Scottish and would have taught him to value most the English contribution to that Britishness.

Forbes left the Academy undecided on a career but with some thought that he might obtain a nomination to the civil service of the East India Company. [80] In a oration in 1875 to an Oxford society Alexander later joined as an undergraduate, the Master said he had accepted an Indian career in deference to his father's wishes. [81] Evidently, Lord Medwyn wanted to ensure his second son, who would not inherit his lands, had a financially secure future in a lucrative and worthwhile career. A career in the civil service of the East India Company involved gaining a successful nomination to the Company's training institution, Haileybury College, which could only come from one of the members of the Court of Directors. Such a nomination was a valuable source of patronage for the directors and was much sought after, for appointment as an Indian civilian was regarded as providing financial security for life, and therefore was desirable despite the risks to health in the Indian climate. The choice of such a career, and the necessary nomination, required influence, which could have come from the family's banking firm, Forbes and Company, and its connection with the East India Company. By 1820 the bank had become one of the two most important of the East India Company's Agency Houses. These banking firms were responsible for remitting to England from India the monies of Company servants and other British merchants there. A lot of this money was consequently invested by its owners in East India Company stock. The votes then obtained in the Court of Proprietors were often put at the service of the Agency House, and the banking firm used them in elections for the Court of Directors to increase the interests of private trade and the City. "The Agency Houses not only formed the bulwark of the

Private Trade interest, but also acted as a connecting link between that interest and the City and Shipping interest." [82] The family's banking firm was therefore in a powerful position, not only to secure a nomination to Haileybury College, but also to assist the career of any young Company servant in India. Later, in his written interview at the Company's London headquarters, Alexander stated that the actual nomination was gained through his maternal uncle, Sir William Cumming-Gordon, who knew the nominating director, a Colonel Toone. [83] As a member of Parliament, Cumming-Gordon was in a good position to approach a Company director such as Toone, who would be reluctant not to nominate a youth so influentially connected on both sides of his family. In a letter on 15 February 1834 acknowledging his nomination, Toone states that it had previously been promised to another youth who was not then old enough to use it. [84] The minimum age of entry to the Company's college was seventeen. [85] If it had been decided on leaving Edinburgh Academy that Alexander should pursue a career in India he also would have been too young to enter Haileybury. His nomination had to come in 1834 at the earliest.

The interval was usefully employed by sending him to Thomas Dale at Beckenham in Kent, a clergyman who was a noted coach for boys preparing for entry into Haileybury. Dale's testimonial submitted with Alexander's Company application in 1834 states that he was with Dale from 11 August 1832 to 29 September 1833. [86] His year with Dale was spent on widening his classical reading and also in studying Euclid and algebra. Dale testified that during this time Alexander's "moral conduct was uniformly free from all reproach, and he envinced a competent diligence in the prosecution of his studies". [87] During this year he lived with nineteen other boys, and his health, which had always been delicate, improved enough for him to join a rowing club, "the only sport, except polo for a

short time in India, for which he was ever fit". [88]

The hoped-for nomination had not yet arrived when Alexander returned home at the end of September 1833 so in the interim he attended Glasgow University. Certificates of attendance were submitted with his Company application from Daniel Sandford, professor of Greek and Robert Buchanan, professor of logic. [89] These show that he attended the session of 1834. The choice of only two subjects indicates that his attendance was only to fill in time until the Company nomination came through. Why this was at Glasgow and not Edinburgh University is not known, but the choice of Glasgow was possibly made because of the reputation of Sandford who was a man of "somewhat similar Oxonian outlook to Archdeacon Williams", the rector of Edinburgh Academy. [90] It is likely that Williams knew of Sandford, at least by reputation, and may have recommended him to Alexander. Alexander's time with Sandford would have further reinforced the anglicized classical education Alexander had received at Edinburgh Academy and with Thomas Dale. Both professors expressed their satisfaction with his work, Buchanan describing him as "a young man of amicable dispositions, gentlemanly manners & very promising abilities".

The required nomination finally occured with Colonel Toone's letter of 15 February 1834. After agreeing to abide by the regulations of the East India College, the forwarding of his academic testimonials and his baptismal certificate to the Company, Alexander went to London to sit the requisite three day preliminary examination. [91] On 23 July 1834 he was finally in possession of official written confirmation of his nomination as a student at the college. [92]

The young Forbes entered Haileybury in July 1834 to begin his required four terms of the college year which began on 1 August and was divided into two terms - 1 August to 21 December and 2 February to 19 June. [93] The college was one of two established by the East India Company in England - the other at Addiscombe, near Croydon, trained officers for the Company's military service. The college for the civil service was originally founded in 1804 at Hertford Castle but was moved to the new purpose-built site at Haileybury in Hertfordshire in 1809. [94] The East India Company considered that training its young civil servants, known as writers, in England rather than in India would see them arrive in India older, more mature and better able to face India's rigours and temptations. The college course consisted of two streams known as "Orientals" and "Europeans" which lasted two years. By 1830 the students had to pass in at least three Indian languages and not suprisingly about a fifth of each new entering class failed the course. [95]

Haileybury developed a rigorous scholastic programme. The Company's aim was to attract distinguished staff by offering high salaries and a university-type status so that not only would its future civil servants be competently educated, but it was also hoped the college would become a centre for oriental studies. [96] The historian of the college claims that its oriental teaching put Haileybury thirty years ahead of any British university in this field. [97] Haileybury professorships in Indian languages had no equivalent in any English university in this period and the Company's aim was met in the staff it attracted, certainly during Forbes' time. [98] Students faced monthly examinations in each subject and the oriental languages required weekly exercises. Sanskrit was begun in the first term, Persian added in the second, Hindustani in the third and Arabic in the fourth. [99] Graduation depended on passing four written examinations (two each year) in Greek, Latin and

mathematics; three Indian languages; law; and political economy and history. [100] Forbes' own examination results show a continuously improving result during his four terms. From the start he excelled in classics, as expected from his previous education. Also in mathematics and law he came top of his class. In Sanskrit and Persian he improved until by his fourth and last term he was also first in his class. Hindustani was apparently more difficult for him and he came tenth in his second term. In his third term he evidently dropped this and took up Arabic, in which he won prizes for both the remaining terms. In his final term he passed first of his class in all subjects, except Persian where he came third. He won a medal in classics and also the Arabic prize that year. [101] His final report by the principal concluded: "The College Council in consideration of his Industry, Proficiency, & Conduct placed him in the First Class...and assigns him the rank of First on the List of Students now leaving College for the Presidency of Fort St. George". [102]

In some respects Haileybury was very different to the Oxbridge education Forbes' previous schooling had been designed for. The academic demands were greater and the presence of young men as old as twenty three or twenty four gave it, at times, an even more rowdy life than a university college of the period. Edinburgh Academy was purely a day school so that he had had little experience of communal life among his peers - only the brief year in Kent where he was under the paternal care of a clergyman. There is no evidence though of this change being a disruptive influence on him, despite the presence of some older, less amenable students. Perhaps the gentlemanly good manners remarked on by all his tutors enabled Forbes to avoid most serious personal conflicts. But something of the promise detected by Archdeacon Williams began to flourish, probably because the academic demands of Haileybury necessitated the perseverance his old rector felt had been lacking in his application to study. Forbes could no longer coast

along on his natural talents, and was one of the "hard-reading men" and a talented scholar.

On 10 September 1836 Alexander Forbes signed the standard covenant (number 3198) between himself and the East India Company, guaranteed by his father for £3000. Alexander's bond of £1000 to the Company was signed by his uncle, William Forbes, and himself. [103] Company servants on the overseas establishment had to enter into these bonds, plus find the securities for faithful performance of their duties. From this time he was officially a writer "on the staff of the Madras Establishment" with his service backdated to his entry into Haileybury. In the same month Forbes sailed for Madras for what promised to be, given his college record, a brilliant administrative career in the East India Company's government of India.

The East India Company had been founded by royal charter in 1600 as a trading company. Its first territorial acquisition in India was made in 1640, at Fort St. George, later Madras. [104] In a succession of events, initially to protect trade, the Company became master over more and more territory, until the battles of Plassey and Buxar in 1757 and 1764 gave the Company control of Bengal. By the end of the eighteenth century the Company had virtually ceased to trade and was increasingly the medium for British rule in India, although much of the Company's profit did not come from India at all but from trade with China in opium and tea. But the demands of Indian government were increasingly beyond the Company's structures and resources, leading to the passing of the India Act of 1784 which established a Board of Control over the Company's directors. [105] Each subsequent renewal of the Company's charter saw the increase of government control until the 1834 renewal resulted in a directive to end its trading operation altogether. Trade

was seen as an unseemly association with government. The Company's rule was totally transferred to the British government after the Indian Mutiny in 1857, and in 1873 the East India Company ceased to exist as a legal entity. The Company's government in India when Forbes joined it consisted of a governor-general of India appointed by the parliamentary Board of Control, with a legislative council to advise him. Under him were regional governors in various Company-controlled areas such as Madras. There was a system of law whose writ ran throughout the Company's territories, which by then equalled approximately half the sub-continent, with most of the rest controlled indirectly by the Company through alliances with Indian princes.

Forbes landed at Fort St.George on 27 January 1837 after a sea voyage of four months around the horn of Africa. [106] All the evidence that remains of Forbes' Indian service are the official Company records and these are sparse, as Forbes was a very new and junior member of a large and far-flung civil service. He remained at Madras for five months learning the local conditions and duties of service. [107] Although just starting his career, as a covenanted civilian Forbes was one of the elite of the service. One Company civilian remembered that "in `vulgar parlance´ he [the covenanted civilian] used to be described as an individual worth £300 a year dead or alive, because of his prospects or his Civil Fund payments if [he] died prematurely". [108]

Forbes was posted on 4 July 1837 to the district of Rajamundry as assistant to the acting collector there. [109] On 9 January 1838 he was gazetted as assistant to the collector-magistrate of the same district. [110] The area was one of the oldest possessions of the Company. It was north of Madras on the eastern seaboard, along the Godovari River. [111] The collector was equivalent to that standard imperial

administrator, the district commissioner, but under the East India Company civilians retained the titles that reflected their commercial past. The collector combined judicial and administrative functions and was a general governor and inspector over his allotted area. [112] To this official Forbes came to serve his apprenticeship. As assistant Forbes could try and fine minor criminal cases; be put in charge of the treasury or matters of land revenue and had to learn the local dialect and case law. He held fourth place in the local official hierarchy after the judge, the collector-magistrate, and the joint-magistrate. [113] A former Company civilian described this period of his career, which illustrates the sort of work Forbes would have been engaged in.

> Whilst he is serving his apprenticeship for the higher offices of Government, he must be prepared to adapt his mind to the most humble and unintellectual duties. He must learn to obey, so that he may understand how to rule. He will have to look after scavengers who are occupied with the drainage and sanitation of the town in which he lives. He will have to count and deliver out postage stamps with his own hands, and woe betide him if his Treasury accounts and cash balances do not agree to the utmost farthing. [114]

Normally after a year and passing his exams the young writer was given charge of a sub-district and eventually became a joint-magistrate, then collector-magistrate and finally judge. [115] However, at the beginning of 1838 Forbes contracted a persistent fever and was granted sick-leave at Cape Town, the Company's nearest `health-resort,' leaving for there in February 1838. [116] His health improved on the voyage but he stayed convalescing at the Cape for nine months. [117]

With his health restored, Forbes returned to Madras in the spring. [118] On the 9 April he was gazetted assistant to the registrar of Sudderand Foujdarry. Commissioned to prepare a digest of laws for the guidance of civil servants, he was probably singled out because of his excellent marks in law at Haileybury and his having been listed as first among the new writers of his year sent to Madras from the college. [119] During this period Perry claims that he devoted his spare time

to a study of Hinduism. [120] His cousin, Francis Skene, in her little book of memoirs of Forbes, says he also studied theology in his spare time and that friends there knew of his desire for what he called "Christian work". [121] This is entirely possible given his ordination just five years later. Certainly there is evidence for his interest in Christian theology during this time in his later controversial synod charge of 1857 where he mentioned that while in India he asked Arabic scholars there the meaning of some scriptural phrases. [122] According to a later intimate friend Forbes' "first deep impressions of religion...came through R.C.'s". [123] This contact was probably made during Forbes' time in India. An aesthetic young man like Forbes, from a devout Episcopalian family, would have been unlikely to have made any contact at all with the small and inconspicuous Roman Catholic Church as it existed in Britain prior to the 1840's. But the situation was different in India. On the subcontinent, where European and Christians were a tiny minority, contact with European Roman Catholic missionaries would have been both more permissible and more possible than at home where Roman Catholic prejudice still flourished. The area covered by the Madras Presidency was an established area of Roman Catholic missions. There were Capuchin missions in the former French settlements, and a number of devoted Irish secular priests as well in the region. [124] Priests from either of these missions would probably have impressed Forbes given his later Tractarian opinions. Was it one of these Roman priests who initially attracted Forbes to a more Catholic Christianity? His contact with the Oxford Movement just two years later would then have enabled him to espouse many of the same Catholic beliefs without the family or social difficulties of a Roman Catholic conversion.

Fever once more struck in his new station and in November 1839 Forbes again applied for furlough and this time sailed for two years' sick-leave in England on 23 January 1840. [125] The fever was possibly malaria to which his poor

constitution could put up little resistance in the conditions of India. On arrival in Britain he returned to his parents' home and for the next four years was on paid sick leave from the Company. Forbes' furlough was extended on 21 December 1842 for six months and then again for a further six months on 21 June 1843 until he finally resigned the Company's civil service on 5 June 1844. During these years from 23 January 1840 to 22 January 1843 he received £250 a year from the Company's Civil Fund, and the appropriate part payment in the final months of 1844. [126] So it was not until the year of his ordination that Forbes finally severed his links with the East India Company.

At the end of 1839 Forbes faced the likelihood that his chosen career was incompatible with his delicate health, and that he would have to reconsider his future. There is some evidence that he was thinking of ordination when he returned from India. In 1875, the year Forbes died, one obituary reported that Forbes won his father's agreement to his going to Oxford to study for holy orders by asking the trenchant question, "whether would you wish me a dead Indian judge or a living Scotch curate?" [127] Forbes' desire to be a priest was also recollected in his cousin's memoir of him. [128] Aspirations to priesthood notwithstanding, aside from his Indian experience Forbes was, in many respects, little different to many other scions of upper class families. His education and wealth, anglicized education and personal contacts enabled him to fit almost anywhere into the upper echelons of British society. The major element of his life which cut across the prevailing English influence upon him was his family's attachment to certain Scottish traditions, particularly their Scottish Episcopalianism and its native nonjuring tradition. It would remain to be seen what effect this Churchmanship would have on Forbes as he made plans for a change of career in the 1840's.

NOTES.

1. DNB., (1899), vol.xix, 412.
2. John Kay, *Edinburgh Portraits*, (1877), 129.
3. Thomas Thomson, *A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen*, (1875), vol.2, 51.
4. William Anderson, *The Scottish Nation*, vol.v, 243.
5. DNB., vol. xix, 377-8.
6. Thomson, Op.Cit., 53.
7. DNB., (1899), vol.xix, 407.
8. Henry Cockburn, *Circuit Journeys*, (1889), 91-2.
9. Henry Cockburn, *Journal*, (1874), vol.1, 167.
10. Cockburn, *Circuit Journeys*, 8-9.
11. DNB., (1899), vol.xix, 412 & 413.
12. William Gilbert, *Edinburgh Life in the Nineteenth Century*, (1901, repr.1989), 26.
13. Ibid., 28.
14. Ibid., 29.
15. Ibid., 26 & 29.
16. Henry Cockburn, *Memorials of his Time*, (1856), 28.
17. From a transcript of his baptismal certificate made by William Marshall, treasurer of St. Paul's Chapel and submitted with Forbes' application to the East India Company on 17 July 1834, IOR.J.1.52, f.247.
18. See the genealogical appendices in William Forbes, *Narrative of the Last Sickness and Death of Dame Christian Forbes*, (1875).
19. William Anderson, *The Scottish Nation*, (1877), vol.i, 740.
20. See n.18.
21. Gilbert, Op.Cit., 22.
22. Anderson, Op.Cit., vol.ii, 232.
23. Cockburn, *Memorials*, 305.
24. Sir William Forbes, Journal of European Tour 1792-93, NLS.1540, f.384.
25. Ibid., NLS.1544, ff.49-50.
26. Ibid., f.51.
27. Alexander Forbes, *Thoughts Concerning Man's Condition*, (ed. John Hay Forbes), (1854).
28. Bruce Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism", in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759*, (ed.) Eveline Cruickshanks, (1982), 36-48.
29. George Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, (1861), vol.iii, 364.
30. Ibid., vol.iv, 35-37.
31. Ibid., vol.iii, 346-7.
32. Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, (1924), 61.
33. See Broxap & J.D.Overton, *The Non-Jurors*, (1902).
34. See a letter of 18 May 1744 by Bishop Gerard of Aberdeen quoted from the original manuscript by Patrick Cheyne in his *The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated*, (1843), 26.
35. John Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, (1922), 69.
36. Ibid., 74.
37. Thomas Rattray, *An Essay on the Nature of the Church*, (1728), 1-2.
38. Ibid., 5f.
39. Ibid., 11.
40. Ibid., 15.
41. Ibid., 23.

42. Ibid., 24.
43. Ibid., 40.
44. Ibid., 42.
45. Ibid., 62.
46. Ibid., 65-6.
47. John Parker Lawson, *History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the present time*, (1843), 257-8.
48. Ibid., 268.
49. W.Stephen, *History of the Scottish Church*, (1894-6), 512.
50. Grub. Op.Cit., vol.iv. 16.
51. F.Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, (1951), 58.
52. Lawson, Op.Cit., 288.
53. Stephen, Op.Cit., 479.
54. Ibid., 514.
55. Dowden, Op.Cit., 78.
56. Ibid., 78.
57. T.Lathbury, *A History of the Non-Jurors*, (1845), 477-8.
58. Grub. Op.Cit., 109.
59. Letter of 27 June 1800, EUML., La.II, f.100.
60. William Walker, *Life of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly and the Right Reverend George Gleig*, (1878), 212.
61. Letter of 24 January 1809, SRO., CH.12.30.97; & of 27 October 1825, SRO., CH.12.30.151.
62. John Skinner, *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy*, (1818), 324-5.
63. Ibid., 340-3.
64. Ibid., 363-7.
65. Letter of 11 January 1849, SRO., CH.12.12.2405.
66. William Perry, *George Hay Forbes*, (1927), 20.
67. John Hay Forbes, *On English Episcopal Chapels in Scotland*, (1846), 9.
68. Ibid., 8-9.
69. John Hay Forbes, *Address to Members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, (1846), 17-18.
70. Forbes, *Address*, 17.
71. *The Edinburgh Academy Register*, (1914), 30.
72. Magnus Magnusson, *The Clacken and the Slate*, (1974), 52; & George Davie, *The Democratic Intellect*, (2nd ed., 1964).
73. Magnusson, 70.
74. Ibid., 93.
75. Ibid., 91.
76. Ibid., 109.
77. *Prize List of the Edinburgh Academy*, (1831), 29.
78. *Prize List*, (1832), 1.
79. IOR., J.1.94, f.95.
80. Perry, 13.
81. Minutes of Chapters, 1874-1878, PH., BHT.
82. C.H.Philips, *The East India Company*, (1940), 43.
83. IOR., J.1.52, f.251.
84. IOR., J.1.52, f.245.
85. Imogen Thomas, *Haileybury*, (1987), 14.
86. IOR., J.1.94, f.97.
87. Ibid.
88. Perry, 13.
89. IOR., J.1.94, ff.94 & 96.

90. Davie, Op.Cit., 28.
91. Frederick Danvers, *Memorials of Old Haileybury College*, (1894), 31; & IOR., J.1.52, f.251-2.
92. IOR., J.1.94, f.93-7.
93. Thomas, Op.Cit., 7.
94. Ibid., 4-5.
95. Brian Gardner, *The East India Company*, (1971), 190.
96. Anthony Farrington, *Records of the East India College*, (1976), 8.
97. Thomas, Op.Cit., 8.
98. IOR., J.1.99.
99. Thomas, Op.Cit., 12.
100. Danvers, Op.Cit., 30.
101. IOR., J.1.99.
102. IOR., J.1.104, f.136.
103. IOR., O.1.97.
104. Gardner, Op.Cit., 41.
105. Ibid., 122-3.
106. IOR., L.AG.23.8.1.
107. Perry, 15.
108. C.T. Buckland, *Social Life in India*, (1884), 81.
109. MacKey, 24.
110. Ibid., 25.
111. George Chesney, *Indian Polity*, (1894), 35.
112. Edwardes, Op.Cit., 80f.
113. Buckland, Op.Cit., 90f.
114. Ibid., 79.
115. Ibid., 94f.
116. Perry, 15.
117. Mackey, 25.
118. Ibid., 25.
119. Ibid., 25.
120. Perry, 17.
121. F.M.F. Skene, *Memoir of Alexander, Bishop of Brechin*, (1876), 4.
122. A.P.Forbes, *A Primary Charge*, (1857), 20.
123. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d.[3 May 1861], PH., KP.iv.
124. K.S.Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, vol.vi, (1944), 80-83.
125. Mackey, 26.
126. IOR., L.AG.20.1.3-4.
127. *The Scottish Guardian*, 15 October 1875, 191.
128. Skene, Op.Cit., 4.

2

OXFORD AND EARLY MINISTRY.

Forbes came up to Oxford on 23 May 1840 and was enrolled in Brasenose College as a gentleman commoner. [1] After the recovery of his health, following some months of convalesence in Italy, his move to Oxford University returned him to the usual career path taken by sons of the gentry, including the increasingly anglicized gentry of Scotland, who finished their education at one of the universities of England. At twenty-two he was old for an undergraduate and, despite his previous academic success, his uncertain health prevented him from reading for an honours degree. [2] Despite this he did achieve a measure of attainment the following year, winning the Boden scholarship for Sanskrit. For someone with his successful East India Company education this would not have been too difficult. The most important consequence was not the scholarship itself but the fact that it brought him into contact with Edward Bouverie Pusey who was on the examination board in his capacity as Regius Professor of Hebrew. In this way Forbes began a personal friendship with one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement, a friendship which would become the most influential relationship of his life. We know from Forbes' later correspondence that their early friendship was close. Unfortunately, lacking any letters from these years, we must rely on the history of the Oxford Movement at this period to understand the profound effect of the Tractarians on Forbes. This focused on the importance of dogma, shaped

Forbes' awareness of the industrial poor and directed his ministry towards them.

Some measure of the impression the Oxford Movement made on Forbes can be gained from the preface he wrote to his edition of the *Remains* of the historian Arthur Haddan which was published the year after Forbes' death. Forbes had first met Haddan at Oxford when Haddan was curate to John Henry Newman at St. Mary's, the university church, (from 1841 to the following Michaelmas term). [3] Haddan also was a lifelong proponent of the Oxford Movement so Forbes' preface includes an encomium to the influence of the movement which had captured them both.

> The great ecclesiastical movement, which has since made itself felt through the length and breadth of the land, was then at its height in the seat of its birth. Thwarted and persecuted by the purblind authorities, the very disabilities under which it rested, gave an additional charm to the young and enthusiastic minds which threw themselves into it. The great leader shewed no external signs of the coming defection. On the afternoon sermons at St. Mary's men hung in rapt attention. Young men from the manor-houses and parsonages of the country, from the streets and squares of the city, (for Oxford then was still the privileged seat of the education of the upper classes,) came term by term under the charm of Oxford, and, in many cases, to Oxford owed their immortal souls...Real earnest self-denial shewed itself in the lives of the undergraduates. Not that they were without their foibles. The manners and dress of the great leader of the movement were imitated to the pitch of absurdity, and a great movement among the young men could not be without its side of unreality. If they assembled in each other's rooms to sing the Canonical Hours in Latin during the season of Lent, it was not a mere exhibition of religious dilettantism. It was the outcome of a real devotion, which made itself felt in many other and tangible ways, - in abstinence from hall on fasting-days, in conscientious attendance at Chapel, in personal assistance at the evening sittings of the Mendicity Society, in regular frequentation of the early Communion at St. Mary's (then the only accessible service of the kind), in conscientious study, in plenteous alms-deeds. [4]

As an older undergraduate Forbes perhaps escaped some of the more boyish enthusiasms and imitations he attests to, but the remarks on singing the daily offices in Lent and membership of the Mendicity Society probably indicate he embraced some of the devotional enthusiasms the movement engendered among the students.

The Oxford Movement was still enjoying unparalleled influence within the university when Forbes enrolled, as it had been doing ever since it began in 1833, when John Keble's assize sermon sparked a fire in the mind of the listening Newman. Keble's sermon was directed against the parliamentary suppression of ten bishoprics in the Church of Ireland, a suppression he labelled as national apostasy. Keble was not asserting the independence of the Church from Parliament, for as a High Church Tory he subscribed to establishment. Rather he was protesting against the failure of the reformed Parliament to defend the interests of the Church. In drawing attention to the growing tension between Church and state since the passing of the parliamentary reform act Keble focused Newman's anxieties on the same issue. But in the original mind of Newman this tension gave rise to a new solution - the claim by the Church of England to spiritual independence from the state, based on its divine foundation as a part of the Catholic Church.

The beginning of the 1830's had seen the collapse in Britain of the old certainties of Church and society. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, the passing of the act for Catholic emancipation in 1829, and the Reform Act of 1832 had represented a widening of the political nation which had serious connotations for the Church of England. Dominated by Parliament since the Reformation, the Church of England could no longer look on that body with equanim ity, since the recent reforms had meant the end of Parliament as a purely Anglican forum. Dissenters could now be elected as members of Parliament as a matter of right. An even greater change was Catholic emancipation which allowed traditional enemies of the Church of England into Parliament. For the Church of England this broadening of the base of parliamentary representation posed a question as to the basis of its authority. [5] One of the old answers had been that the authority of the Church was grounded on its legal establishment in Parliament

as an expression of the will and consent of the nation. But with the reform acts of the early nineteenth century, the state had publicly recognised that the nation was in fact religiously pluralistic and likely to remain so. The Church could no longer look to Parliament for privileged support. The Church of England was therefore faced with the question of its own authority and legitimacy. What was its legitimacy in a nation that was no longer understood to be completely Anglican? Could the Church itself continue to rely on its parliamentary establishment as the basis for its authority; and if not then what was the alternative?

Some answers had been attempted before the Oxford Movement. The author of the classic account of the movement, Dean Richard Church, recognized two. Richard Whately had published anonymously in *Letters of an Episcopalian* (1826) an argument for the existence of the Church independent of the state, but Church said Whately's argument was "too abstract" to attract widespread support. [6] The other attempt was made by Thomas Arnold. In his *Principles of Church Reform* (1833) he proposed the Church of England, as an established Church, should be made broad enough to encompass all Christians, while non-Christians should be tolerated, but excluded from active participation in the Christian state. But for Dean Church, as for many others, Arnold's proposal was "too unhistorical and revolutionary". [7]

The Tractarian answer was to propound a theology of the Church of England which stressed its spiritual authority and independence from the state, with its identity based on its substantial links to the early Church, and so to Christ, which had not been broken at the Reformation. This theology gave the Church of England an authority deriving from Christ and not from parliamentary establishment. Initially the Oxford Movement was a defensive response to constitutional crisis, an

immediate crisis of legitimacy and authority. However, the Tractarians' argument for the independent existence of the Church from the state very soon led them beyond mere reaction. The Oxford Movement, although initiated by a political crisis, soon became a distinctly religious movement seeking religious and not political answers.

The Oxford Movement had its immediate origins not only in reaction to the constitutional crisis, but also in the ferment of one of the most original intellects of the century. In John Henry Newman's mind, concerns about the status of the Church of England had connected with his reading of the Fathers of the early Church occasioned by his transition from Evangelicalism, via an awakened reason, to High Church views. This change in Newman also brought about a reaction against his former rationalism, a reaction which raised for him the basis of ecclesiastical authority. [8] His patristic reading resulted in Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833) in which Newman's "theological preoccupations are never far from the surface". [9] Not only does this book reveal evidence for Newman's concern about Church and state relations prior to his hearing Keble's assize sermon, it also anticipates much of the theology and agenda of the Oxford Movement.

The book is an historical work on the Arian heresy and the development of Nicene orthodoxy associated with Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, who provoked imperial persecution by upholding the Nicene Creed. The battle of Athanasius against the heretic Arians gave Newman a format to express his own understanding of doctrine and revelation. Newman thought that Arianism was a success in the fourth century because it was a critical movement rather than a positive dogmatic truth, because it was always more exciting to attack than to uphold orthodoxy. For Newman the rise of the heresy was a warning of the danger of rationalism exceeding its own limitations, which were at most "to detect error, rather than to

establish truth". [10] Heresy developed when reason trespassed into the area of moral or revealed truth. The Arians were the type of uninhibited rationalism and of its consequences. The correct attitude to revealed truth for Newman was one of reserve - a withholding of the fullness of revelation until its hearers were properly prepared, morally and in submission to God, to hear and accept it, lest divine truth be rejected or even mocked by being paraded before unfit persons. Reserve followed from the nature of the truth being communicated. There had to be a reverence for its sacred mystery because it was God's truth. To communicate such truth the Church was the divinely authorised and necessary teacher, using scripture to prove that teaching. [11] As well as scripture there was also the apostolic (or oral) tradition subordinate to, but supporting, scripture. [12] The Arian heresy demonstrated to Newman the inadequacy of scripture alone because it was the heretics who advocated using only scriptural words in formulating credal statement. For Newman the scriptural truth about the relationship of the Son to the Father had been best upheld against the Arian heresy by the non-scriptural words of the Nicene Creed. The creed demonstrated the Church fulfilling its teaching office by thus defining doctrine, which was thus an "adequate symbol" of revealed truth. Neither was doctrine simply a matter of intellect alone, Newman claimed, because it was connected to worship and morality in that it "directly assists the acts of religious worship and obedience". [13]

The conflict between Athanasius and the emperor also gave Newman a pattern for interpreting the contemporary predicament of the Church of England and its relation to the state. The Arian heresy showed him that too close an alliance between Church and state could lead to a comprehension of incompatible views and a dilution of the Church's truth. (What Newman at least once in his history refers to as "liberalism".) This occured during the fourth century because

the demands of imperial policy for comprehension conflicted with the requirement of the Church to be faithful to God's truth. Doctrine, according to Newman, as a symbol of God's truth, must be exclusive of error, even if it proves divisive. Failure to understand this was Constantine's error. The Church was not just an adjunct of the state but, as a visible society, a divine foundation, and the agent of the gospel, it had an existence separate from civil society. Where Christians were members of both, their membership of the Church was superior. [14] Conflict between the two was almost inevitable, not only because of a government's "liberalism" but also because divine truth went beyond reason and was therefore sure to provoke bafflement and the hostility of the world.

The hero of Newman's book was Athanasius who embodied the rule that peace was pure before it was peaceable. [15] Athanasius personified for Newman the independence of the Church from the state and the requirement of the Church to uphold dogmatic truth against politics' inevitable need for compromise. This was also a present danger as Newman asserted at the book's conclusion:

> Then as now, there was the prospect, and partly the presence in the Church, of an Heretical Power enthralling it, exerting a varied influence and a usurped claim in the appointment of her functionaries, and interfering with the management of her internal affairs...Meanwhile...we may rejoice in the piety, prudence, and varied graces of our Spiritual Rulers; and rest in the confidence, that, should the hand of Satan press us sore, our Athanasius and Basil will be given us in their destined season, to break the bonds of the Oppressor, and let the captives go free. [16]

The "theological preoccupations" apparent in *Arians* formed much of the theology of the Oxford Movement. This included The importance of dogmatic truth as an adequate symbol of revelation; the need to uphold this against a relativistic theological liberalism; the necessary connection between doctrine and morality and worship; the Church as the authorised teacher and interpreter of divine truth; and the Church of England as a part of the Catholic Church and therefore having an existence independent of

the state. One important theme of the Oxford Movement that did not figure prominently in Newman's book was the movement's sacerdotalism (perhaps the existence of important ecclesiastics on both sides of the Arian controversy made it difficult for Newman to exalt the clerical office). However, Athanasius was the major figure and the saviour of the situation and Newman at least once in *Arians* explicitly exalts the priestly office, which was, he claimed, "the most momentous and fearful that can come upon mortal man". [17]

Keble's Assize sermon of July 1833 led to a meeting at Hadleigh rectory which gave rise to the *Tracts for the Times*. Of the participants at the meeting two men especially influenced Newman and so, with him, were the original shapers of the Oxford Movement until the recruitment of Pusey in 1835. These were John Keble and Hurrell Froude, both raised in High Church clerical families. These two men pulled Newman, and the ensuing movement, in diametrically opposed ways. Keble had learned from his father, whom he reverenced, to distrust originality and love tradition. This drew Newman further toward the Catholic tradition of the Church of England, enshrined in the High Church tradition. However, it also exacerbated the conservatism of the movement which at times made it almost idolise the past, and ensured its suspicion of the new theological thought emerging later in the nineteenth century. Froude, on the other hand, enjoyed shocking established ways. Although he revered Keble, and fervently held to the High Church belief in the catholicity of the English Church, Froude had become disenchanted with its Protestant heritage and especially with the Reformation. [18] But the effect of Froude on the movement was primarily through his influence on Newman, as he died in December 1836. Keble retired from the university in the same year, to emulate his father by taking a country living, at Hursley in Hampshire. The loss of these two men to Oxford meant that Newman was left in

an even more pre-eminent position within the movement. So the development of the Oxford Movement was more affected by Newman's own development than might have been the case if Keble had remained in Oxford. Edward Pusey's adherence to the Oxford Movement in 1835, with his lengthy tract on baptism, was regarded by Newman as giving the movement a new respect from his position within the university and his aristocratic name. But Pusey was too retiring and too serious to develop a popular following. Like Keble, he could affect the thought of the movement and the unfolding of its theology, but neither of these two leaders could vie with Newman's widespread influence, even had they wished to.

The course of the movement until 1845 remained centred within Oxford university, at the very heart of the Church of England. Unreformed Oxford was still a predominantly eccle siastical institution. It was "one of the great schools of the Church" so that its "traditions, its tone, its customs, its rules, all expressed or presumed the closest attachment to that way of religion which was specially identified with the Church." [19] It remained a national institution despite the university's self-contained and even self-satisfied life. As Dean Church famously described it:

> The scene of this new movement was as like as it could be in our modern world to a Greek πολις, or an Italian self-centred city of the middle ages. Oxford stood by itself in its meadows by the rivers, having its relations with all England, but, like its sister at Cambridge, living a life of its own, unlike that of any other spot in England, with its privileged powers, and exemptions from the general law, with its special mode of government and police, its usages and tastes and traditions, and even costume, which the rest of England looked at from outside...It was a small sphere, but it was a conspicuous one. [20]

Not only was Oxford removed from the rest of England; it was also remote from most of the contemporary developments in religious thought affecting Europe at that time. Biblical criticism had been little heard of among the colleges. The

only one who had made any serious study of higher criticism had been Pusey who, in 1828, had published his *Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany*. However, by 1834 even he had repudiated this cautiously favourable presentation under the influence of High Church criticism from Hugh James Rose, who convinced Pusey to accept the incompatibility between historical criticism and a Catholicism understood as dogmatic. [21]

The leaders of the Oxford Movement were all disposed towards a radically traditional response to the contemporary situation, although for different reasons. Newman and Keble wanted to address the needs of the Church in a new political environment; Pusey, when he joined, was concerned about the threat of critical thought to doctrinal certainties and the challenge of atheism. All three felt that the answer could be found in the reassertion of the Catholic nature of the Church of England and in the rediscovery of Catholic tradition. In this view they were united with the older High Church tradition, to which the Tractarians owed much. [22]

It was Newman's influence which provided the most immediate stimulus in the emergence of a Tractarian group distinct from the High Church party. While High Churchmen like Hugh James Rose, the convenor of the Hadleigh meeting, were prepared to petition the government, Newman thought this too tame and wanted to publicise the cause in a more aggressive way. Hence the *Tracts for the Times*, especially the first ones, were designed to achieve a greater publicity and popularity. They were available to readers for a penny and written in the deliberately controversial tone of which Newman was a master. The first Tracts, published in September 1833, reiterate much of the theological agenda contained in Newman's *Arians*, though now with the sacerdotal element more aggressively

present. The Tracts reminded their readers of the divine basis of the Church, independent of the state. They located this basis in the apostolic succession and pointed to the bishops as the successors to the apostles; to the priesthood as a divine and awesome commission; to the need to take a stand when the state infringed the rights of the Church. They called on their readers to note that the Church was not a state creation but a part of the Catholic Church of Christ. The first Tracts urged readers to oppose attempts to alter the prayer book, because these were based on dislike of its doctrine, and this would lead to a dilution or compromise of divine truth. [23] For the Tractarians dogma was, as Newman elsewhere succinctly put it, a "Mystery" that is, "a doctrine *lying hid* in language". [24] These early Tracts therefore highlighted three fundamental issues for the Oxford Movement - the emphasis on dogma, the apostolic succession of the bishops, and the sense of contemporary crisis for the Church of England.

The years between 1833 and 1845 witnessed the development of the Oxford Movement under the urgency and militancy of the Tractarians. In 1836 they orchestrated a campaign against the appointment of R.D.Hampden as Regius Professor of Divinity. Hampden was already suspect to the Tractarians for advocating the admission of Dissenters to the university and for his 1832 Bampton lectures which questioned the place of dogmatic theology. Their campaign against Hampden resulted in the university Convocation voting in May 1836 to deprive him of his vote in choosing university preachers. But the same year saw one of the first signs of real opposition to the movement in Thomas Arnold's emotional article in the *Edinburgh Review* titled "The Oxford Malignants". In 1837 Newman published *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, his classic expression of the Anglican position as the *via media* between Rome and Geneva. The first episcopal condemnation of the Tractarians came in 1838 when the Evangelical

Bishop Sumner of Chester drew attention to papist tendencies within the movement. The publication of Froude's *Remains* by Keble and Newman in February 1838 alarmed many by revealing Froude's warmth towards Roman Catholicism as a true but flawed Church, and his intense dislike of the Protestant Reformation. The beginning of 1839 saw an attempt to test Tractarian loyalty to the Reformation in a subscription for a memorial to the Reformation bishops martyred in Oxford. Newman spent that summer studying the Monophysite controversy of the fifth century which began to bring to the surface his doubts about the Anglican Church. But while the summer of 1839 marks the beginning of Newman's interior struggle towards Rome, the exterior failure of the movement in Oxford dates from the publication of Newman's Tract 90 in February 1841. For some of the younger followers of the movement, the claim that the Church of England was Catholic opened their eyes to the more explicit catholicity of the Roman Church. Newman wrote Tract 90 to convince such followers that the Anglican Church was just as Catholic as Rome, and that the Protestantism in the Thirty Nine Articles was only in apparent contradiction to Catholic teaching. But to many outside the Oxford Movement Tract 90 appeared a betrayal of the Anglican Church to Rome. Tract 90 was condemned in a letter from four leading Oxford tutors on 8 March 1841, and by the heads of colleges on 15 March. In November Newman was moved to write a public letter of protest over the plan by the Church of England and the Lutheran Church in Prussia jointly to send a bishop to Jerusalem. But the most obvious sign that the university establishment had turned against the Tractarians came in January 1842, when the Tractarians failed to get their candidate appointed Professor of Poetry. In February 1843 Newman retired to nearby Littlemore. In June a university sermon by Pusey on the eucharist was condemned without a hearing by the heads of college and Pusey suspended from preaching for two years. Newman resigned as vicar of St. Mary's on 7 September and on 24 September preached

his final Anglican sermon, the symbolically-titled "Parting of Friends", at an emotional eucharist at Littlemore. After this he retired into unofficial lay communion while followers and antagonists waited for the expected move to Rome. On 13 February 1845 Convocation voted to condemn the Tractarian W. G. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church* for its endorsement of the Roman Church and, by a much smaller majority, to strip Ward of his degree. But a motion to condemn Newman as well was vetoed by the proctors, to great approval. But the finale was in sight, and on 9 October Newman was received into the Roman Catholic communion.

At the heart of the Oxford Movement's defeat was its attitude to Roman Catholicism which stimulated the traditional no-popery of the Church of England. The sympathy towards Rome which developed among the Tractarians can be illustrated by the thought of Edward Pusey, the most enduring of Anglicans. Although Pusey claimed to have been taught High Church doctrines by his mother, his 1828 book on German theology reveals that he was far more favourable to the Evangelical point of view than he later remembered. However unlike many Evangelicals he did not see Rome as the Antichrist. [25] After his appointment as Regius Professor of Hebrew, Pusey began to move in a High Church direction under the influence of Bishop Lloyd of Oxford and especially of John Keble. These two men made him aware of tradition as a bastion against rationalism and also of the practices of the early Church. Pusey began to shift from judging Rome by the standards of the Reformation to taking the early Church as the measure of catholicity. With that yardstick his attitude to Rome, like all the Tractarians, began to soften. Such a measure made him less sympathetic to the changes associated with the Reformation, and more aware of the isolated position of the Church of England compared with the rest of Catholic Christendom, which the Tractarians adjudged to

include the communions of Rome and Orthodoxy. Newman and his like-minded followers took this position to what they understood as its logical conclusion and joined the greater Catholic body centred at Rome. Pusey, Keble, and the others who remained within Anglicanism could agree with Newman as to the more explicit catholicity of Rome but could not agree with him in denying the Anglican Communion a place within the Catholic Church. It was a position Newman found illogical, and for some years he expected Pusey's conversion. Newman's secession actually increased Pusey's feeling for Rome as he rationalised his friend's move as a divine means of bringing the two Churches closer together. By the end of the 1840's Pusey held the classic Tractarian position towards Roman Catholicism, which maintained the Church of England could not ignore or deny the greater Catholic body in communion with Rome. Nor was it any longer able to uphold the position of the Church of England as the model of a reformed Catholic Church. Instead, Tractarianism measured Catholicism by "all that was held in common by the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches". [26]

Such an attitude was the crux of the difference between the Tractarians and their High Church sympathisers, and as Tractarians' attitude towards Rome softened, High Church reaction to the Tractarians hardened. By 1836 Rose had become alarmed at the opinions adopted by some of the younger Tractarians, especially the view that the Reformation had deprived the Church of England of certain Catholic truths present in the early Church. Rose, and High Churchmen like him, could not agree with the increasingly critical view of the Tractarians towards the Reformation, nor with their sympathy to Rome. High Churchmen were wedded to the Reformation as the standard of Anglicanism, provided it was interpreted by the Caroline Divines and the early Church. [27] The Tractarians gradually became attached to the early Church as the normative Catholic standard, and to judge the

Reformation by that norm. It made them critical of the Reformation and warmer towards Rome than High Churchmen found comfortable, or Evangelicals could countenance.

It was into the heart of this *avant garde* movement that Forbes was brought by his connection with Pusey after winning the prize for Sanskrit. More than anyone else in the Oxford Movement, even Newman, Pusey sought sanctification through the mystical experience of the soul's direct awareness of its communion with God. [28] Forbes was also one of the numbers of undergraduates enduringly influenced in the search for holiness by Newman's four o'clock sermons at St. Mary's. Newman's withdrawal from Oxford coincided with Forbes' time there as an undergraduate so his influence on Forbes would necessarily have been less immediate than was Pusey's. There remains little evidence for his friendships and intellectual influences upon Forbes at this time. In 1842 he attempted to have an article published in the high Tory *Blackwood's Magazine*, so his politics probably remained those of his family and fitted the traditional link between High Churchmanship and Toryism. Perry says he knew W. G. Ward and Martin Routh, the venerable president of Magdalen College. Forbes himself, in a later letter, referred to a Heathcote as a "dear friend" and the "first of my Oxford set who has gone to his account". [29] This may well have been W.B. Heathcote who, as precentor of Salisbury cathedral, signed the Tractarian protest against the Denison judgement in 1856. If so, it suggests Forbes' "set" was a group of undergraduate Tractarians. However, as a mature student, Forbes may well have been friendly with the younger fellows as much, if not more, than his undergraduate contemporaries. Passing references in Charles Marriott's letters to Forbes helping him with his work on the *Library of the Fathers* confirms the remembrance of James Nicolson, Forbes' colleague in Dundee, that Forbes immersed himself at

Oxford in the study of the Fathers. [30] The contact with Marriott gave Forbes the friendship with one of the most lovely personalities of the Oxford Movement. Marriott was a fellow of Oriel and had returned there in 1841, having had to relinquish his post as principal of Chichester Theological College because of his delicate health. He was a thorough scholar, well-read in the Fathers. He returned to Oxford just at the time Newman was retiring from the university scene. Marriott endeavoured to take his place among Newman's confused undergraduate followers, and he gave himself unstintingly to their needs and to the literary labours of others, to the detriment of his own writing. In 1850 he succeeded C.P.Eden as vicar of St. Mary's. John Burgon, as one who knew him well, considered "his primary qualification for supplying Newman's place was his unswerving loyalty...his absolute and undoubting confidence in the Apostolicity of the Church of England". [31] In forming an attachment with Pusey and with Marriott, Forbes came under the influence of two leaders of the Oxford Movement who remained convinced of the catholicity of the Church of England, and whose Tractarian thinking never led them to contemplate conversion to Rome, despite their undoubted sympathy for Roman Catholicism. Forbes' labours for Marriott indicate his usual attention to study, an application which led to his being awarded a fourth class pass in classics on graduation in 1844. This was a rare distinction for one not reading for an honours degree. [32]

Forbes evidently maintained his links with the Scottish Episcopal Church during these years. One of his very few letters surviving from this period is to John Alexander, the priest involved in the building of a new mission church, dedicated to St. Columba, for the poor in the Old Town of Edinburgh. In it Forbes asks for more information about the subscriptions for the new church. [33] The church was also meant to provide a use for the Scottish Communion Office in

Edinburgh, in conjunction with its existing use by the Carrubber's Close congregation, of which John Alexander was the pastor. This support for the Scottish Communion Office was a fundamental ingredient in the subscription of the Forbes family to the project. [34] But despite Alexander's fervent support the plan failed, because Bishop Terrot held him to a previous agreement with the bishop to discourage any such usage. [35]

Forbes was ordained deacon by Bishop Bagot of Oxford on Trinity Sunday 1844 and went as assistant curate to the parish of As. ton Rowant. He was twenty seven years old. A small country living of about eight hundred people, the parish comprised the two villages of Ashton Rowant and Kingston Blount. It was about twenty miles east of Oxford and about two hours on horseback from the city. Forbes began his ministry there the following Sunday, June 9, and immediately found himself in sole charge because the vicar was ill. [36] A letter to his brother describes his work as typical of a country parson. [37] He must have found the quiet of the country a great change from India or Oxford. With the vicar ill he would have been virtually divorced from the intellectual companionship and stimulation he had found so important at Oxford. Perry cited two other letters, which suggest a sense of comparative isolation, as they are more full of the news and gossip of Oxford and even of Scotland, than of his parish. He also sent his brother a witticism, asking "why do the Puseyites dislike pews so much in churches?...Because they are so much attached to forms". [38] Forbes did not enjoy his rural ministry very much. His delicate health and his intellectual isolation made him ill-suited to the life. He seems to have taken a number of opportunities to escape to Oxford, to research his brother's queries on patristic or liturgical sources, or just to keep contact with old friends. [39] He was reprieved in October. Called back to Edinburgh where his mother was seriously ill, he resigned the title and told

his father he could never stand another country living. [40] But, perhaps like all first appointments, the memory of As ton Rowant remained with him fondly enough for him to write to the vicar in 1868, and invite himself back for a Sunday "to see all the improvements in the Parish in which I take so deep an interest". [41]

It must have been Pusey who had the influence to get him his next position, at St. Thomas', West Oxford, whose vicar, Thomas Chamberlain, had been Senior Student of Christ Church, and was deeply influenced by the Oxford Movement from its beginning. The living was in the patronage of the college and Chamberlain was appointed to it in 1842 after having been vicar of Cowley. A man of "strong convictions backed by a determined will", he was inspired with the idea of making St. Thomas' a model of Tractarian piety and pastoral practice, the first such parish in the Church of England. [42] He succeeded so well that one of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce's first acts on becoming Bishop of Oxford in 1845 was to remove Chamberlain as rural dean, on the grounds that he was a party man. [43] Under Chamberlain, St. Thomas' became the premier Tractarian parish in the city. It had suffered prior to his arrival by not having a resident vicar, the living having previously been filled by Students of Christ Church, who lived in college. Chamberlain soon bought two cottages near the church and turned them into a clergy house. There he lived with his curates, an early model of the sort of community of celibate priests the Tractarians strongly believed was a means of providing pastoral care for the masses of unchurched urban poor. Chamberlain remained unmarried all his life. He introduced the daily offices and expected his curates to attend, and there was a celebration of Holy Communion on saints and other holy days. He was a believer in incessant house to house visiting in an area where there were large numbers of labouring poor, dilapidated housing, and many brothels. The brothels Chamberlain drove out, by the simple expedient of targeting

them for frequent visits. [44]

Forbes was ordained priest in 1845 by Bishop Bagot, and at St. Thomas' was given particular charge of the Boatman's Floating Chapel. [45] This was a barge moored on the canal which served as a chapel on Sundays for boatmen who worked on the canal and the river, and for their families. On weekdays it became a school for children. [46] He received the small stipend of £70 a year, and he must have drawn from his own private means for, in 1846, Forbes financed renovations to the church which Chamberlain was preparing to make. These included a new north aisle and chancel arch; the dismantling of a low chancel ceiling which partially obscured the east window; and removal of some old high box pews. [47] While most of the ritual innovations for which the parish became famous (or notorious) were introduced after Forbes' time, these renovations, which must have brought the altar in greater prominence within the church, prepared the way for them. One important friend Forbes met while there was Richard Benson who later, in 1866, became the founder of the first religious order for men in the Church of England. [48]

In 1846 Forbes published an article in *The Ecclesiastic*, a Tractarian journal edited by Chamberlain, on "Parochial Work in France". [49] Alongside the living experience of St. Thomas' the article provides further insight into Forbes' model for parish work. He drew attention to the valuable place of the confessional in French parochial work and commented that the practice was conducive to holiness. The place of the priest in the lives of his people and their growth in religion was furthered by administering the last rites, his daily visiting round, and the Sunday sermon. Forbes commended this form of parochial work as an example to the Church of England, where the clergy began with an advantage over their French

counterparts in having greater wealth and social standing. The experience of the French parochial clergy may have been known to Forbes from his own European travels, or it may have come from Pusey who was the leading Tractarian exponent of sacramental confession. The article demonstrates the influence of European examples on the formation of Forbes' Tractarian ministry. Both the Tractarian St. Thomas' and the French example demonstrate that by 1846 Forbes had before him the example of the ministry of single priests, living in community, and being prepared to go out among their people with an active sacramental ministry. But it was Forbes' personal experience of St. Thomas' and the influence of Thomas Chamberlain that was undoubtedly one of the major influences for his later parish work, and Forbes continued to visit Chamberlain almost every year of his life, whenever he went to stay with Pusey.

It was in the same year that Forbes joined the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity, a move which points to the influence of religious life upon him at this time. Perry claims that Forbes actually founded this as a devotional society for undergraduates, but the Roll records that he was not admitted as a member until 1846. [50] The society, according to the minutes, was originally founded as the Brotherhood of St. Mary in December 1844 for the study of ecclesiastical art, with four members. Soon after it became a more devotional society named after the Holy Trinity, but the Master remained the same as before, Edwin Millard of Magdalen. As he remained in this position until he retired it is reasonable to assume that he, not Forbes, was the founder. Its original rule gives an indication of the sort of piety Forbes found attractive by 1846, if not before. Members subscribed to a simple rule of life - to rise early; be moderate in food; spend a part of each day in "serious reading"; to speak evil of no one; avoid drunkenness; to recite the "Glory be" first thing in the morning and on going to bed; and to

pray for the unity of the Church, the conversion of sinners, the advancement of the faithful, and members of the brotherhood. [51] There was also a more detailed rule of life for use as a voluntary discipline which had been drawn up by Pusey, but there is no record of it among the Brotherhood minutes. The society had many of the external signs of a quasi-religious order - the officers were known by religious titles such as Master and Almoner; there was a badge for members to wear and it had monthly "chapters". Among the membership were many names prominent either in the development of the Catholic revival or in Forbes' later life. They include George Boyle, Roger Lingard, Richard Benson, Edward King, Charles Lowder and Arthur Henry Stanton. [52]

It was death of his mother on 11 July 1845 that brought about the termination of Forbes' ministry at St. Thomas'. After spending some time in Edinburgh following the funeral, he decided he was needed near his father for the immediate future. He advised Chamberlain accordingly, and his name appeared in the parish registers for the last time on 8 February 1846. [53] Forbes may have been stimulated to offer his services to the Scottish Episcopal Church by the Marchion ess of Lothian who suggested he should work for his "own Church". [54] Bishop David Moir of Brechin wrote to Forbes on 19 May 1846, and contacted him again on 10 June. He had not been able to find a clergyman for the charge of Stonehaven so would willingly accept Forbes' services. The parish had been vacant since 22 January but Moir could not offer a sufficient stipend, which was probably the reason he was finding it difficult to fill the charge. He could guarantee only £60 a year which was all the congregation could afford. Moir understood that Forbes had offered his services for a limited time. The bishop informed him that the number of the congregation was between three and four hundred. "There are several respectable families in the town and its vicinity

belonging to the congregation. The fishing village of Cowie, in the immediate neighbourhood is inhabited almost exclusively by members of the Congregation." [55]

The following July Forbes wrote to his father that he was not likely to suffer from overwork in Stonehaven but that he was disappointed over the lack of church attendance. "The lower part of the town contains many who never go near a church, who are worse than heathen." There was no use even building a school, he said, for the children simply would not go. Forbes also encountered a lively opposition from the friends and family of the previous priest, who had been dismissed by the bishop for contumacy. (He had been summoned to appear before the bishop's court to answer a charge of drunkenness and not attended.) Forbes was further annoyed that the previous incumbent had "totally neglected the poor here". [56]

Stonehaven had had a continuous Episcopal congregation since the days of the disestablishment of episcopacy in 1690, and its congregation included a predominance of fisher-folk who kept themselves apart from the town, were sometimes illiterate, and lived in simple "but and ben" cottages. The congregation was used to the Scottish Communion Office, for which quarterly communion tokens were dispensed and the liturgy celebrated with little ceremony. They kept their distance from the Church of Scotland, whose worship their services resembled except on Communion Sundays, and they had a fear of popery. So Forbes' first pastoral contact with the Scottish Episcopal Church was with a congregation tracing its origins to the nonjuring days and which, unlike many in the south of Scotland where he was raised, had a large proportion of the lower classes among its adherents. Forbes made little changes in the short time he was there but he did,

like Chamberlain in Oxford, introduce the daily offices, which were attended by sufficient parishioners to be encouraging. [57] He also found the practice of communion tokens so agreeable that he continued to use them for the rest of his life.

The nonjuring connection and the adherence of the poor were evidently important to Forbes, and he wrote a small romantic novella based on the Stonehaven congregation during the illegal days of the eighteenth century. *The Prisoners of Craigmacaire* (the Gaelic name for Stonehaven) told of the occupation and "pacification" of the town by the Hanoverian troops after Culloden and especially of the consequent suffering of the Episcopalian fisher-folk there. The story has all the romanticism of a Walter Scott novel - a dashing Jacobite laird who rescues imprisoned Episcopal ministers; loyal and brave Episcopal countrymen, smugglers, and women who assist the saintly suffering clerics. The story includes the famous incident from Episcopalian folklore of the imprisonment of three Episcopal ministers in Stonehaven gaol in 1746, where the fisher-women held their babies up to the gaol window to be baptised. [58] At this point the story becomes a vehicle for Forbes' own Tractarian agenda regarding Roman Catholicism. The three Episcopalian ministers find themselves imprisoned with a Scots Roman Catholic priest from the Jacobite army and discover a common ground of religion.

> He [the Roman Catholic] had hitherto classed all the reformed bodies under one category, of course varying more or less, but all built on a sandy foundation. He was now surprised to find principles boldly asserted, which though to his mind grossly misapplied were nevertheless true principles, and which they ratified by appeals to the early Church, an authority to which he gave due weight. The Scotch clergy on the other hand were agreeably surprised to find that a man of his opinions might yet be a good Christian. [59]

The novella indicates that the sympathy for the tradition of the Scottish Episcopal Church Forbes had learnt in his family was reinforced by his contact with living examples of that same tradition, and that his imagination was stirred by his

ministry in a locality which witnessed some of the suffering of the Episcopal past. It is also suggestive of a gap between the Tractarian Forbes and native Episcopalians in their respective attitudes to the Church of Rome.

The same sympathy stirred him again in a more critical fashion in an article published in *The Ecclesiastic* in 1846. "The Revolution and the Nonjurors" was a review of the novel by W.Gresley, *Coniston Hall, or the Jacobites; a Historical Tale*. In the article Forbes revealed his antipathy towards the Revolution of 1688 which he considered an unholy, violent overthrow of the "constitutional order of things". It resulted in the Church of England succumbing to both Latitudinarianism and the dominance of the state. He revealed his qualified affections for the Nonjurors as being "the energetic element in the Church" but whose removal had meant the Church, while not losing her supernatural power, gave up her claims to apostolic authority and foundation. After the Revolution, Forbes thought the Church looked to the state for her *raison d'être*. But at the same time the Nonjurors created a schism which left the Church of England crippled and at the mercy of the state.

> They extort our respect while we regret their act. They carried with them most of the Catholic element of the Church of England, and then, quarreling among themselves, rent it in pieces and cast it to the winds. Theirs is the only act of confessorship in ecclesiastical history that has been attended with no apparent good. [60]

The contrast with his novella is important. In the story Forbes reveals an emotional sympathy for the sufferings and witness of the nonjuring Scottish Episcopal Church. But in the article he reveals an awareness of the shortcomings of that nonjuring tradition as regards the Church of England, believing the Nonjurors left that Church debilitated in its Catholic claim and life and prey to the two evils identified by the Oxford Movement - Erastianism and Latitudinarianism. For Forbes the Nonjurors were a very mixed blessing.

Another article for *The Ecclesiastic* written that year exhibits Forbes' thinking about social problems and the loosening of the ties between the working classes and the Church. "On Religious Guilds" lamented the suppression of the medieval religious guilds at the Reformation. [61] These, he argued, were conducive to the unity of society by their inclusion of members from all ranks of society, while their benevolence to members in need supported the work of the Church. These two aspects of the Church's outreach were now, in many cases, left inadequately in the hands of a single vicar. He felt the numerous membership of the guilds had been better able than a single priest to deal with the victims of large scale unemployment or disease. Their revival would be a means of fostering attachment to the Church among the working classes who were more in the habit, he considered, of identifying their interests with Dissent. The article had a romantic view of the social cohesion of medieval society founded upon a common faith. But it does show that Forbes was concerned about the declining influence of the Church among the working classes, and was thinking about the unity of nineteenth-century society.

It was around the time he went to Stonehaven that there is evidence for his anxiety over Newman's secession, and he turned to William Palmer of Magdalen College for advice. Palmer was an extreme High Churchman who had been a classics tutor at Magdalen when Forbes was at Oxford. Palmer had anticipated the argument of Tract 90 in a Latin preface to the Thirty Nine Articles for his pupils, but played little part in the Oxford Movement. He spent most of the 1840's seeking ways to bring about intercommunion between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. While Forbes' letter to Palmer does not appear to have survived, Palmer's reply, written in July 1846, has. [62] In it Palmer made a very lengthy reference to Newman's *Essay of Development*, opining it was not widely influential,

and that Newman's theory of development was unacceptable to the Roman Church. He went on to refer to an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* by J.B.Mozley that Forbes had obviously mentioned. He thought that Forbes "rather hasty" in criticizing Mozley for saying that "argument from the Orbis terrarum" was no longer applicable. Palmer said that Mozley "did not mean that the consent of the Orbis terrarum [i.e. the Catholic (universal) Church] against Britain now if it existed would not tell just as conclusively as the consent of the Orbis terrarum against Africa & the Donatists in the time of S. Austin". Mozley was not objecting to the argument from such a worldwide Catholic consensus, Palmer asserted, but to the fact that it was not applicable in the present because it did not exist. There was universal Christian condemnation against the position of the Donatist schism in the fourth century, but there was no such worldwide consensus existing in the nineteenth century to use as an argument to condemn the Anglican position. Palmer's reply indicates that Forbes apparently had two anxieties. The first was the possible widespread effect of Newman's secession, and more particularly about Anglicans finding compelling the argument of Newman's *Essay*. The second was that the consensus of Catholic Christendom may have stood against the truth of the Anglican position. What is most significant at this stage is that Palmer's letter is evidence that Forbes had been unsettled in his understanding of the Anglican standpoint by Newman's secession. His criticism of Mozley seems to presuppose that Forbes did think that there may exist the possibility of a consensus of the Catholic Church, the Christian *orbis terrarum*, denying the validity of the Anglican position. Palmer's use of the example of the schismatic Donatists suggests that Forbes had used it in his letter to him. It would appear therefore that Newman's secession caused Forbes to think, however briefly, that the Anglican Church could be in schism.

In May 1847 Pusey nominated Forbes to the Bishop of Ripon as vicar of St. Saviour's, Leeds, and said that he hoped there would be no difficulty about it. [63] Pusey had cause to be concerned. Just as St. Thomas' Oxford showed how a Tractarian parish could develop strongly when the vicar's Anglican loyalties were secure, St. Saviour's showed what happened when they were not. It also revealed some of the pitfalls the Oxford Movement fell into when it moved beyond the confines of the university into the parishes of the Church of England. Pusey had financed the building of the church and was its patron. He had chosen Leeds because of his personal friendship with the vicar, W.F. Hook, and because it was an evident case of need. The whole of the recently-industrialised city constituted a single parish and it was therefore a glaring illustration of the inadequacy of the Church of England in meeting the needs of the new urban masses. Pusey intended the parish to be an example of the effectiveness of Tractarian models of ministry in this new urban society, and of the the power of Tractarian piety to attract the unchurched poor.

Pusey, of all the Tractarian leaders, was most aware of the destitution of urban poor and consistently endeavoured to relieve their lot. He passionately believed the Church of England had a moral obligation to remind society that the poor had souls and therefore should not be exploited. He often drew attention to the social dangers of leaving cities without an adequate religious presence. In his *Cathedral Institutions* (1833) Pusey had drawn attention to the widespread squalor of England's cities, where he believed the presence of the Church could bring a civilizing influence. Pusey also had a particular concern for the religious poor, and to assist them he advocated the abolition of pew rents and the development of religious education and parochial schools. [64] One scholar has drawn attention to Pusey's campaign for church extension, in which Pusey advocated the building of

churches where the eucharist would be celebrated weekly, and he pawned his wife's jewels and sold his carriage to help finance such projects. Pusey was, therefore, at the forefront of Tractarian plans to revive the parishes of the Church of England as eucharistic communities. [65]

Pusey intended St. Saviour's to encapsulate some of his ideas on urban mission. It would be staffed by priests living communally. They would serve a parish that in 1838 had a population of approximately 6000. These were mostly poor, in an area with few shops and many public houses on the eastern outskirts of the city which was immersed in the wretchedness and dirt of the industrialized city. The foundation stone was laid on 14 September 1842 after the bishop had unofficially sanctioned the experiment of a college of priests for the parish. At the consecration of the church in October 1845, however, he objected to some of the evidences of Tractarianism in the building, and caused the dedication to be changed from that of "Holy Cross" to St. Saviour's. [66] Disagreements soon emerged between Hook and priests of St. Saviour's over their ritualism. Hook was not intolerant of Tractarianism, nor of mild ritualism. [67] However, Hook would not tolerate teaching or ceremony which he considered outwith the comprehension of the Church of England and which emulated Rome. In January 1847, one of the curates of St. Saviour's, was received into the Roman Catholic Church together with two lay assistants of the parish. Following the curate's secession, Hook had insisted on the resignation of the vicar. [68] A new vicar was not easy to find because St. Saviour's was a poor living in squalid conditions with arduous pastoral work, and it was also suspect as a breeding ground for conversions to Rome. Therefore clergy who went there were regarded by Hook and the bishop as suspect in their loyalty to the Church of England. Hook's experience of St. Saviour's had by then completely [illegible] his former sympathies for the Tractarian experiment.

Forbes began work there in April 1847 without a curate, the bishop also having joined Hook in his condemnation of the parish as untrue to the principles of the Church of England. Forbes lived on his own in the vicarage, and the wife of the schoolmaster kept house for him. Each Sunday there was Matins with Holy Communion following, and Evensong. There was also Sunday School to be taught in the morning and afternoon. The daily office was said publicly during the week. There was a cholera epidemic that year in Leeds and Forbes was a regular visitor at hospitals. It was a risky practice as three Roman Catholic priests and one of the Anglican curates died of it. [69] Charles Marriott was anxious about the lack of assistance which was causing Forbes' health to suffer, but as he told Pusey, "Curates are as scarce as potatoes". [70] In July there was some prospect of help although Hook was actively discouraging prospective candidates. [71] By this time relations between Hook and Pusey had reached an all-time low and Forbes was caught in the middle. In August Hook bluntly told Pusey that St. Saviour's would remain an object of suspicion as long as Pusey continued to be patron, and he asked Pusey and his fellow trustees to resign. "We could", he added, "manage to get on with Mr Forbes, if he were to appear to me as a substantive character." However he suspected Forbes was merely an agent to acquire and send penitents to Pusey for aural confession. Hook went on vehemently:

> You will not be able to carry into effect the object you have in view. Not while I am Vicar of Leeds, for I am uniting myself with the moderate Evangelical Party under the conviction that it is by them, improving as they are in Church Principles, and not by your Friends, dissenting Church Principles as they do, that the Glory of God will be promoted in the Church of England...I am ready for war, if it be the Lord's will that I maintain the cause of His Church here against you - but I desire that peace which will ensue by your retreating from ground which you are unable to occupy. [72]

Hook's vitriolic demands and accusations stirred Pusey to defend Forbes and himself. Hook, he thought, was overestimating the office of patron and if he were

to give that office up it would not alter the present circumstances. He believed that his resignation as patron would render Forbes' position untenable. "Forbes is my friend; he would not cease to be so. My relation to him is not as patron, but as friend." Pusey's resignation as patron would only "encourage those who suspect Forbes, &, as you say `watch his every movement & report it to the Bp.´ to weary him out of holding St. Saviours". If he remained as patron these opponents would know that Forbes would only be replaced by someone similar. Pusey claimed that once his appointment of the vicar was made he had no more to do with the parish than with any other parish in England, save for his financial grants which were necessary because of St. Saviour's poverty. He asked how Hook could raise any question of Forbes' being a "substantive character", and he assured Hook that it would be a mistake to "hold aloof" from Forbes simply on account of his connection with Pusey. He also denied that Forbes was a vehicle to send Pusey penitents. [73]

The argument demonstrates some of the pressure Forbes was under in Leeds. St. Saviour's was helping to confirm in the minds of many in the Church of England a connection between the Oxford Movement and Romanism, a suspicion that began with the publication of Froude's *Remains* and Tract 90. Deeply shaken by the previous Roman Catholic conversions among the St. Saviour's clergy Hook was ready to listen sympathetically to those who accused Forbes of leaning that way. These opponents kept the parish and the vicar under close scrutiny for any false move. Alongside the difficult living conditions and the lack of curates, Forbes had to minister in an atmosphere of distrust. The argument between Hook and Pusey exemplifies the rift between some High Churchmen and the Tractarians which had developed apace since Newman's conversion. The number of similar Roman Catholic conversions since then made High Churchmen like Hook join the

Evangelicals in their distrust of Tractarianism as a breeding ground for popery.

Forbes' appointment to St. Thomas' and St. Saviour's connected him with two of the earliest attempts of the Oxford Movement to move from an academic environment into a parochial one. It was a move often associated with urban parishes situated among the poorer working classes, and Forbes' friendship with Pusey would have directed his thoughts and ministry in this direction. While St. Thomas' undoubtedly gave him an example to emulate, St. Saviour's gave him one to avoid. The Leeds parish demonstrated how people were alienated by Catholic ritual and practice when it was too far in advance of their understanding or prejudices; especially when, by too close an emulation of Roman Catholic ritual engendered by naive enthusiasm on the part of some inexperienced Anglo-Catholic clergy, such ritual evoked the traditional anti-popery of the British. When that happened, potential allies like Hook, were alienated and the work of the parish disrupted. It is difficult in these early years of Forbes' ministry to determine exactly what his own priorities in such parish work were. As a curate he had been assisting the initiatives of others, and his time in Stonehaven and Leeds was too short for his own plans to emerge. The shape and initiatives of his own Tractarian ministry, influenced by these experiences, only fully emerged when Forbes embarked on his long ministry at Dundee.

NOTES.

1. J.Foster, (arr. & ann.), *Alumni Oxoniensis: the members of the University of Oxford 1715-1886*, (1887), vol.II., 475.
2. F.M.C.Skene, *A Memoir of Alexander, Bishop of Brechin*, (1876), 5
3. A.P.Forbes (ed.), *Remains of the late Rev. Arthur West Haddan*, (1876), xif.
4. Ibid., xi-xii.
5. R.W.Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833-1845*, (3rd ed. 1892), 51f.
6. Ibid., 5-9.
7. Ibid., 8.
8. J.H.Newman (ed., Martin Svaglic.), *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, (1967), 39
9. Ian Kerr, *John Henry Newman*, (1988), 48.
10. J.H.Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, (3rd ed. 1871), 30.
11. Ibid., 50f.
12. Ibid., 226.
13. Ibid., 150.
14. Ibid., 264f.
15. Ibid., 251.
16. Ibid., 406.
17. Ibid., 153.
18. R.H.Froude, *Remains*, (1838), vol.1, 388.
19. Church, Op.Cit., 153.
20. Ibid., 159-60.
21. H.C.G.Mathew, "Edward Bouverie Pusey:From Scholar to Tractarian", in *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., vol. xxxii, (1981), 118.
22. Peter Nockles, "The Oxford Movement: historical background 1780-1833", in *Tradition Renewed*, (ed. Geoffrey Rowell), (1986), 24-50.
23. Tracts 1-3 in *Tracts for the Times*, (1834).
24. A.Hardelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*, (1965), 32 n.31.
25. Robert Greenfield, "Such a Friend to the Pope", in *Pusey Rediscovered*, (ed. Perry Butler), (1983), 162-184.
26. Ibid., 173.
27. Reginald Fuller, "The Classical High Church reaction to the Tractarians", in *Tradition Renewed*, Op.Cit., 53.
28. Christopher Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, (1933), 117.
29. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d.[1863/4], SAUL.19.2.284.
30. C.Marriott to E.B.Pusey, February 1844, PH., PP.Lett.134; & J.Nicolson, *In Memoriam*, (1875), 4.
31. John William Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, (1891), 163.
32. Perry, 22.
33. A.P.Forbes to J.Alexander, 15 March [1844], SRO., CH.12.5.34.
34. A.P.Forbes, *Jesus our Worship: A Sermon preached at the Consecration of St. Columba's Church, Edinburgh*, (1848), 28.
35. Ronald Johnson, "A Short History of St. Columba's Episcopal Church 1843-1969", (typed and duplicated booklet, 1977), SRO., CH.12.5.81, 8-9.
36. Perry, 24.
37. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, postmarked 12 September 1844, SAUL.19.1.10.
38. Ibid.
39. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d.[1844], SAUL.19.1.12.
40. Perry, 28.
41. Letter of A.P.Forbes, June 1868, LPL.3417, f.101.
42. A.B.Simeon, *A Short Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Chamberlain*, (1892), 10.

43. Thomas Squires (ed.), *In West Oxford*, (1928), 23.
44. Ibid., 18f.
45. Mackey, 38.
46. Squire, Op.Cit., 24.
47. Ibid., 18.
48. M.V.Woodgate, *Father Benson*, (1953), 33.
49. A.P.Forbes, "Parochial Work in France", in *The Ecclesiastic*, vol.i, 1846, 81-89.
50. Roll of the Brethren 1844-1858, PH., BHT.3.
51. Minutes of Chapters Dec.1844-Oct.1856, PH., BHT.1-3.
52. Ibid., 17f.
53. Perry, 31-2.
54. Mackey, 41.
55. D.Moir to A.P.Forbes, 10 June 1846, SPC.
56. A.P.Forbes to J.H.Forbes, 17 July 1846, SPC.
57. William Palmer to A.P.Forbes, July 1846, LPL.1895, f.101.
58. John Archibald, *A Ten Year's Conflict and Subsequent Persecutions*, (1907), 157-8.
59. A.P.Forbes, *The Prisoners of Craigmacaire: a story of the '46*, (1852), 42.
60. A.P.Forbes, "The Revolution and the Nonjurors", in *The Ecclesiastic*, vol.i, 1846, 213-222.
61. A.P.Forbes, "On Religious Guilds", in *The Ecclesiastic*, vol.i, (1846), 49-53.
62. W.Palmer to A.P.Forbes, 4 July 1846, LPL.1895, f.101.
63. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d.[May 1847], PH., PK.ii.
64. David Forrester, *Young Doctor Pusey*, (1989), 153-160.
65. R.W.Franklin, "Pusey and Worship in Industrial Society", in *Worship*, vol.57, (1983), 386-412.
66. John Pollen, *Narrative of Five years at St. Saviour's, Leeds*, (1851), 33-36.
67. Nigel Yates, *Leeds and the Oxford Movement*, (1975), 15-16.
68. Nigel Yates, *The Oxford Movement and Parish Life: St. Saviour's, Leeds, 1839-1929*, Borthwick Papers no. 48, (1975), 8-9.
69. Pollen, Op.Cit., 57-8.
70. C.Marriott to E.B.Pusey, 18 June 1847, PH., PP.Lett.134.
71. C.Marriott to E.B.Pusey, 20 July 1847, PH., PP.Lett.134.
72. W.F.Hook to E.B.Pusey, 3 August 1847, PH., PP.CUP.5.4.
73. E.B.Pusey to W.F.Hook, 14 July[1847], PH., Hook correspondence, 426.

3

THE TRACTARIAN BISHOP.

When Alexander Forbes was consecrated Bishop of Brechin in 1847 he was the very first Tractarian to become a bishop. During the first ten years of his episcopate Forbes began to express the ideals of the Oxford Movement he had already espoused earlier in his ministry. It was the beginning of a Tractarian ministry influenced by the heavily urbanized environment of Dundee. In Dundee Forbes began to reinvigorate an Episcopal congregation which, like the Episcopal Church generally, had been largely introspective. He worked to develop a congregation that was inclusive of the urban poor, focused around the Church meeting as a eucharistic community. Forbes also set a powerful example to his own clergy, and to the Episcopal Church, of responsiveness to the labouring poor and of civic involvement. But he also worked to provide his clergy with materials to enable them to become theologically competent, as well as to be confessors and spiritual directors, a priority clearly inspired by his Tractarianism. As a bishop, and one of the leaders of the Episcopal Church, Forbes soon demonstrated he was a staunch supporter of the old nonjuring tradition insofar as it was equated with the Scottish Communion Office and a monarchic episcopate, although he remained critic al of nonjuring theology. During these years as a bishop Forbes encountered the low level of church attendance among the labouring poor and the working classes that he had already commented upon at Stonehaven, and no doubt met at

Oxford and Leeds. The Oxford Movement had previously made him aware of rationalistic liberalism undermining belief in the Church's doctrine. Now Forbes began to propose the formulation of a dogmatic theology which, coupled with sacrificial living among the poor, he believed could reawaken confidence in the spiritual realities taught by the Church.

The process by which Forbes came to be nominated as Bishop of Brechin illustrates one of the important reasons for his influence as a bishop. His nomination was the result of support for his candidacy by influential figures within the Episcopal Church, the chief of which was William Gladstone. In August 1847 William Gladstone was on his annual visit to his father* at his country estate of Fasque, in the Mearns in the east of Scotland. While there he heard of the death of David Moir, the Bishop of Brechin. On 27 August, the day Gladstone attended the bishop's funeral, he wrote to Alexander Forbes. [1] There is no record of this letter but on the 1 September Gladstone wrote to Walter Goalen, the Episcopal priest at Laurencekirk and his first cousin, to ask his opinion of Forbes. [2] He wrote to Lord Medwyn the next day and to Forbes again on 7 September. [3] On the 8 September he recorded in his diary that he had seen Forbes "on the bishopric". [4] Gladstone was, therefore, the instigator behind the proposing of Alexander Forbes' name for election as Bishop of Brechin. He was able to do so because of his own involvement with the Scottish Episcopal Church and because he knew the Forbes family.

* Contrary to what Mowat and Perry state, Gladstone was visiting his father and not his brother. Thomas Gladstone did not succeed as baronet until his father's death in 1851.

Gladstone's own knowledge of the Episcopal Church came as a result of his father's move to Fasque. Sir John Gladstone was himself a Scot, of Presbyterian stock, who had joined the Church of England after moving to Liverpool. He was a successful merchant in Atlantic and North Sea trade and the West Indian sugar plantations, so that he was worth more than half a million pounds by 1828. [5] A backbench M.P. before the Reform Act, Sir John had bought the country seat of Fasque in 1830 as an expression of his rise in society. [6] By then William, his fourth son, was at Oxford, but he took an active interest in the new family home, and especially in the Episcopal Church. In doing so Gladstone was probably realising an interest he remembered from his mother's family background. Anne Mackenzie Robertson was John Gladstone's second wife and came from a minor line of highland Jacobite Episcopalian gentry. Gladstone later recalled his maternal grandmother as "stoutly Episcopalian and Jacobite". [7]

Gladstone's contact with the Episcopal Church led to his scheme for the establishment of Trinity College, Glenalmond, in Perthshire. This was to be a combined theological college and public school. Gladstone first mooted the idea with Henry Manning in 1840, and with James Hope, another Tractarian layman, he circulated a formal proposal for subscriptions the following year. The foundation stone was laid in 1846 and work began the next year. The institution was inspired by the Oxford Movement, being concerned to educate boys in Church principles and also to train candidates for ordination in a system akin to Roman seminaries. [8] Under its first warden, Charles Wordsworth, later Bishop of St. Andrews, the school was modelled on an English public school and was another agent of anglicization among the Scottish middle class. It was the Trinity College project that brought Gladstone into contact with the Forbes family. The first mention of them in Gladstone's diary was on 3 September 1845 when he wrote to Lord

Medwyn and his sons "on College and Church matters". [9] This could not have been the first contact however as the following day Gladstone dined at William Forbes, Medwyn's oldest son, at what he familiarly described as "a College and Ch. party". [10] William Forbes became a member of the board of trustees of the college and kept Gladstone informed about the battles over the use of the Scottish Communion Office in the college chapel. For the next two years Gladstone corresponded regularly with both Medwyn and William Forbes in connection with Trinity College. His first recorded meeting with Alexander was at a dinner party at Fasque on 26 October 1846 during the time Forbes was at Stonehaven, and Gladstone recalled a conversation with him about Dante, to whom both men were devoted. Gladstone wrote of Forbes that he liked him "particularly". [11] Alexander was apparently a house-guest at this time, for the day after Gladstone shared a walk with him. [12] Gladstone kept in touch with this likeable young man. In May 1847 he read Forbes' commentary on the penitential psalms. [13] Later that same month he met him in London. [14]

Gladstone's personal religion predisposed him towards using his influence in Forbes' favour in the Brechin nomination. His religious position had undergone a severe disruption from his experience of practical politics. By 1847 Gladstone had already discovered that his theory of a revived Anglican confessional state (as set forth in his *The State in its Relations with the Church*, published in 1838) was impractical. He had come to understand that such a revival was an unreal expectation in the increasingly pluralistic Britain of the mid-nineteenth century. In 1845 he had resigned from the Conservative cabinet over the proposed government grant to the Roman Catholic seminary of Maynooth. But he supported the grant from the backbenches however, reflecting his awakening to the religious plurality of the British state. Against increasing government support for undenominational

Christianity Gladstone increasingly thought the Church of England needed to be free of its ties to the state which, he felt, shackled its ability to uphold a Catholic Christianity with a distinctive dogmatic content. This was the kernel of his commitment to religious liberty after the 1840's. Nonetheless, if he could never again be a public upholder of the state as an Anglican entity (as demanded by his Tory and High Church constituents of Oxford University), in his private religion he remained a Tractarian. [15] However, Gladstone's Tractarianism was no mere adherence to a party, but an individually conceived form. Gladstone had developed his own High Church theology, independent of the Oxford Movement, by the mid-1830's. His understanding was centred on the Church as a divine institution, having its own *magisterium* as a consequence of retaining its apostolic links. It was a theology that did not reject his Evangelical upbringing but built upon it. For Gladstone the Oxford Movement complemented, not contradicted, the Evangelical revival, and consequently he abhored those who turned these two streams of Anglicanism into antagonistic parties. Gladstone abhored factions in the Church of England because, after the 1840's, they were incompatible with his emerging ideas of an inclusive catholicity in religion. He therefore strongly disagreed with the pro-Roman Catholic radicals in the Oxford Movement, but defended them publicly as a matter of justice, because ultra-Protestants in the Church were not similarly persecuted. By the mid-1840's, however, these radical elements had destroyed Gladstone's hopes of the Oxford Movement capturing the Church of England and transforming it into a more devout and truly national Church. Gladstone was a Tractarian insofar as his spirituality was based on the Church and particularly on the eucharist - he was religiously most at home in the devotional atmosphere of Margaret Street chapel for example. But he was not a Tractarian if by this is meant adherence to a particular ecclesiastical party. The historian of his religious opinions considered that "Scottish episcopalianism with its caroline ethos, and its

communion office based on Laud's Scottish Liturgy probably approximated most closely to his own ideal of Anglicanism as both Catholic and reformed". [16] The Scottish Episcopal Church was also a Church free of state restrictions, unlike the Church of England.

Forbes himself conformed to Gladstone's attitude to the Oxford Movement. As well as his personal affinity with the younger man, Forbes' ministry in Leeds demonstrated he was not disposed to the unbridled pro-Roman enthusiasms of his predecessors. To Gladstone, for whom such Roman excesses were responsible for the failure of the Oxford Movement to capture the Church of England, this can only have enhanced Forbes' candidacy. Gladstone also knew of and respected the Forbes family's history of support for the Episcopal Church, which meant he was proposing the name of a candidate with solid Episcopalian credentials.

The election of the bishop was solely in the hands of the priests of Brechin diocese, therefore it was important for Gladstone to find one of them to support his candidate. Perry claims that Gladstone visited Robert Thom, the priest at neighbouring Drumlithie and a senior figure in the diocese, and that Thom became an enthusiastic supporter of Forbes' candidacy. [17] At the later electoral synod it was Thom who proposed Forbes, which assured his name of serious consideration by the electors. However there is no mention of Thom, or a visit to Drumlithie, anywhere in Gladstone's diary between Bishop Moir's death on 21 August and Forbes' election on 15 September. It seems unlikely that some mention would have been omitted when Gladstone was punctilious in recording other visits and correspondence made during his visit to Fasque. In fact the earliest mention of Gladstone's visit to Thom comes much later, in Donald Mackey's *Memoir*, published in 1888. Certainly there must have been some connection made with one of the

Brechin clergy to secure a nomination to the bishopric and Robert Thom would not have proposed Forbes at the electoral synod without agreeing to the suggestion beforehand. But the only contemporary source, Gladstone's diary, is silent about any connection between Gladstone and Thom. What the diary does record is a lengthy conversation between Gladstone and Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford on 26 August, the day before Gladstone wrote to Forbes. [18] Wilberforce was at Fasque for the consecration of the new chapel two days later. There were also a number of letters written to Lord Medwyn, and a conversation with the primus, Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen, "on several immediate questions", at a dinner party on the night of the consecration. [19] Did Gladstone simply forget to enter a visit to Thom in his diary, or omit it as insignificant? Or, following his usual practice of wide consultation on important matters, did he first sound out the opinions of Bishop Wilberforce, Lord Medwyn, and the primus before approaching one of the Brechin electors? That elector was his first cousin, Walter Goalen. Was it Goalen who then approached Thom? This seems likely, and it demonstrates the important personal connections Forbes' candidacy could muster. Forbes' father, a judicial lord and the head of one of the most important Episcopal families with a proven record of support for the Church; William Skinner, the leading bishop; Samuel Wilberforce, while having no official voice within the Episcopal Church, as a bishop of the Church of England represented an important influence for many Episcopalians; and finally Gladstone himself. Forbes' candidacy could be presented to the priests of the small Diocese of Brechin as having the support of significant figures in the Church. This support illustrates the weight of influence Forbes himself, as Bishop of Brechin, could hope to bring to bear on important issues and projects.

The electoral synod was convened at St. Mary's, Montrose, on 15 September. Dean Horsley of the Dundee congregation was too ill to attend, which left nine priests entitled to vote. There were two candidates, Forbes and William Henderson, the incumbent of St. Mary's, Arbroath. Henderson was proposed by Torry Anderson, the joint incumbent of Dundee. The vote was six votes for Forbes and three for Henderson. Forbes' supporters included Goalen and John Moir, the son of the previous bishop. [20] Gladstone heard the news that same afternoon and declared it to be a "great mercy". [21]

Forbes wrote to Pusey with the news of his election and told him that his first thought was "lest the Church suffer from my life and secondly the awful responsibility: yearly decreasing congregations: a house divided against itself: all things apparently against us". He asked if he could come to Pusey to prepare for his consecration, as he thought "a fortnight's retreat at Oxford wd. help me". [22] No one from his family could be unaware of the contemporary state of the Episcopal Church, and these comments of Forbes point to his realisation that divisions continued within the Episcopal Church. They had not been solved with the formal grounds for union of the qualified and nonjuring congregations in 1804, and strains between the two groups continued into the middle of the century.

The continuing tension between northern and southern Episcopalians since 1804 had focused on the most visible difference between the two, namely the Scottish Communion Office in preference to the English eucharistic liturgy of the *Book of Common Prayer*. After 1804 Bishop John Skinner of Aberdeen and the northern bishops, who were a majority at this time, revealed a nervousness about the power of the south with its links to the attractive establishment of the Church of England and feared that their northern tradition would be overwhelmed. Skinner

devoted his charge to the clergy of Aberdeen in 1806 to this subject, and to the need to retain their own Scottish traditions in worship. According to his son, Skinner had:

> reason to suspect that there were, among the junior clergy of Scottish ordination, some whose ambition it was to be considered Clergymen of the Church of England, and who, if they had not already abandoned the use of the Eucharistic service of the Scottish Church, were ready to do so, - for no other reason but that it was Scottish! [23]

The intimation by Skinner of the possible publication of the Scottish Communion Office complete with doctrinal explanation caused concern in the south, where there was fear that such a step would revive the acrimony of last century over liturgy, and that the *Book of Common Prayer* would be reduced to a subordinate role. The former qualified and English clergy also felt nervous and insecure about their position so soon after the union of many of them with the Scottish Episcopal Church. The tension surfaced again in 1816 over the election to the diocese of Aberdeen. The election of William Skinner to succeed his father was not regarded favourably by the southern bishops and clergy. They argued that the north had more than half the bishops and that someone from the south should be elected to keep the balance. More particularly, they did not want someone from the Skinner family for, despite John Skinner's work for union, the Skinners were thought too wedded to northern traditions to work well with the south. [24]

The northern bishops were conscious of being inheritors of a definite theological tradition from their nonjuring past and all had a strong attachment to the Scottish Communion Office. Having a majority in these early decades of the nineteenth century they managed to secure the place of the Communion Office. At the General Synod of 1811, in Aberdeen, the fifteenth canon gave this liturgy primary authority over the *Book of Common Prayer* and dictated that it was to be used at all consecrations of bishops. The new canons further stipulated it could not

be dropped from use by a congregation without the approval of all the bishops. [25] But a sign of the increasing influence of the south was during the General Synod of 1828 when the clause in the canon forbidding the relinquishing of the Scottish Office without the consent of all the bishops was changed. Henceforth, the permission of the diocesan bishop alone was all that was required. [26]

The northern bishops also revealed themselves as conscious inheritors of their nonjuring past with regard to the episcopate. Like their eighteenth-century predecessors, they upheld the tradition of powerful, monarchic bishops. In his first charge to his clergy, on the need for liturgical uniformity, Bishop Gleig of Brechin used almost identical language to that of Thomas Rattray in Rattray's *Essay on the Nature of the Church* (1728). Gleig maintained that party spirit could not:

> be *widely* spread among us, if we keep constantly in our recollection the unquestionable truths, that the Clergy of one diocese have nothing whatever to do with the affairs of another; that every diocese, under its own Bishop, is a particular church...and that the union of dioceses into National Churches is maintained only by the union of several Bishops under the Divine Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, and by Canons enacted for the government of the several dioceses thus united in one body. [27]

Other northern bishops also identified with this tradition of exalted diocesan episcopacy. At the General Synod in 1811 the clergy were given the vote for the first time, and canons were passed requiring that both houses - bishops and clergy - approve all legislation. [28] Bishop Jolly of Moray considered that this synod diminished the episcopal prerogative. [29]

The attitude of the northern bishops towards their own episcopal authority retarded the inclusion of the laity in the councils of the Church. John Skinner, pastor of Forfar and son of Bishop John Skinner, had early become aware of the need for the representation of the laity in synods. Stimulated by the visit of Bishop Hobart of New York in 1823, he suggested an emulation of this practice of

American Episcopalianism. [30] But his bishop, Patrick Torry, feared the inclusion of laity in synod would erode episcopal authority and was "too hazardous" an experiment. [31] This issue, like that of the Communion Office, was not resolved at that time, although some steps towards wider government were taken. In the 1828 General Synod a canon was passed providing for annual diocesan synods and a General Synod every fifth year. [32] This removed the initiating of synods from the bishops and made them a regular event. But due to the influence of the northern bishops Low and Jolly, and the weakness of the elderly Gleig as primus, another General Synod was convened the following year which repealed both the canon about the General Synod and that giving the clergy a veto on acts of General Synod through their own diocesan synods. [33] Jolly had objected to the canons of 1828 because they implied that the apostolic authority given to the bishops to govern the Church was diminished. Jolly's concern was partly justified as the laity were unlikely to have the theological ability necessary for the synodical formulation of doctrine. But much of this opposition to the laity in synod came from the bishops' understanding of the episcopate as holding the plenitude of spiritual authority and power, a view which reduced the clergy and laity to passive recipients of episcopal decisions.

The early nineteenth century also witnessed the arrival of Evangelicalism in the Episcopal Church for the first time. The Calvinist theology of some Evangelical clergy who appeared in the south was something of a shock to the bishops as Calvinism had been rejected among Scottish Episcopalians after 1689. [34] The introduction of Evangelicalism came about through the visit to Edinburgh in 1822 of Gerard Noel, a Church of England Evangelical. Noel's disciple, Edward Craig, minister of St. James' chapel, Edinburgh, later attacked James Walker, professor of the Theological College, in 1826 over Walker's upholding baptismal regeneration.

The concern of the bishops and clergy over this attack, on what was unanimously regarded as the doctrine of the Church, prompted the calling of an Episcopal Synod in 1826. In the event the synod did nothing because the bishops did not want to prejudice their authority by attempting to impose on Craig a discipline he was likely to repudiate or ignore. They did, however, commend a declaration from over thirty clergy criticising Craig and upholding Walker for his "true doctrine". [35]

In the first half of the nineteenth century the Episcopal Church concentrated on its own internal unity and organisation. This was a consequence of the Church adjusting to the transition from its illegality of the eighteenth century to its legal existence in the nineteenth. Despite Forbes' comment to Pusey about declining congregations there was growth in real terms. Before his death in 1830 Bishop Sandford of Edinburgh had seen six new churches built in the south, including two in Edinburgh. His clergy in the diocese of Edinburgh had grown from seven to twenty five, of which five were formerly clergy of qualified congregations and seven were for newly-formed congregations. [36] The period between 1792 and 1840 was largely one of internal organisation and stabilisation. Churches could now be built for the first time in years. Clergy could be openly recruited, and worship could be offered publicly. The Episcopal Church needed time to adjust to this new situation before attempting anything by way of evangelization or a greater involvement in society. These years were spent putting its own house, not just in order, but fashioning it on the scanty foundations of the previous century. This caused tension and argument, particularly between the northern and southern portions with their different emphases and theological nuances; and between bishops used to running the small body without interference and competition. Reluctantly, the bishops began to share the government of the Church with the clergy in synods which met with greater frequency and dealt with more and more business.

By the 1840's a major shift in the theological and geographical basis of the Episcopal Church was beginning to be noticeable. As a result of the pull of industrialization and, to a lesser extent, the push of the Highland emigration, the south was fast becoming the area of greatest population and Episcopal growth was most rapid there. This meant that the predominance of the north and the nonjuring tradition in the Church was coming to an end. The increasing strength of the south meant also the greater influence of the Church of England, as clergy of English birth or Scots of anglicized disposition took it for their model. It was not that the southern clergy were diametrically opposed to those of the north. In fact most of them were disposed toward the High Church persuasion of the Church of England and therefore had much in common with the northern tradition. But there were differences of emphasis. William Walker remarks on this difference of southern Churchmanship in his reminiscence of Bishop Michael Russell when Russell was Bishop of Glasgow and also pastor of the congregation at Leith after 1809.

> In his "form of doctrine" and style of services he was a man of his age and of his diocese; resembling a clergyman of the eighteenth century English type, rather than the Keiths and Forbeses - those ardent Jacobites and Usagers - who had preceded him at Leith. There was, so far as the writer remembers, little if any difference in the mode in which the service was conducted in the Edinburgh churches in the early "Forties". It was the old moderate High Church style. [37]

It was the same High Churchmanship that, in England, was initially favourable to the Oxford Movement but parted company with it because of High Church suspicions about the movement's Romeward tendencies. On the other hand Evangelicalism, which stood in opposition to both, played little part in these tensions as it was represented throughout the century by only one or two independent chapels in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

Despite the problems Forbes mentioned to Pusey he had a personal appreciation for the Episcopal Church. He respected its witness to Catholic truth

and patristic tradition during its penal suffering of the eighteenth century. Forbes regarded this witness as being more complete than that to be found in the Church of England at the time, although he accepted that there was very little in Episcopal services of worship that could give a sensible expression of this truth. As he commented in his novella *The Prisoners of Craigmacaire* in 1852:

> In her [the Episcopal Church] there is no aesthetic charm nor much food for the imagination. Her ritual is meagre, her services few and tasteless, her outward form loveless and unattractive, but she has the higher and more ennobling poetry of earnest endurance and patient suffering for the conscience sake. Her past history has been one of temporal misfortune borne unflinchingly in a noble cause. Her present is one of no less trial, though of a more subtle nature...who shall deny that when England was lost in the distressing lukewarmness of the last century, hearts further north responded to the harmonies of Catholic truth, and sighed after Catholic unity? Who knows not that a fuller and purer service obtains in her public liturgies, that the mixed chalice, the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the hallowed gifts, the express oblation of the same...still remain to her, and that tradition asserts that even nearer approaches to the Apostolic model from time to time obtained? [38]

But while appreciative of the Episcopal Church, Forbes did not completely identify with either the northern or the southern groups. Forbes' election cemented the place of Tractarianism within the Episcopal Church, and Tractarianism stood at a critical distance from both older groups. It looked at both sympathetically but with reservations. English High Churchmen, like the Nonjurors, were applauded by Tractarians for their history of upholding of Catholic doctrine, but not for their support of the principle of establishment. The Nonjurors were also questionable for their schism, and for the vagueness of some of their teaching. In the Scottish context that meant Forbes, as a Tractarian, favoured the Scottish Communion Office and the authority of the episcopate as evidences of Catholic teaching, but also criticised the northern tradition for its eucharistic doctrine and lack of ritual in worship. But nor did he like the unquestioning perfection ascribed to the Church of England by the southern High Churchmen. As the first Tractarian bishop, Forbes became a focus within the Episcopal Church for those sympathetic to the Oxford

Movement, and thus was the focus for a smaller third force within the Church. But his English connections among the Tractarian leadership ensured that Forbes' actions would not be lacking in support south of the border.

Alexander Forbes' election was confirmed by the bishops and he was consecrated Bishop of Brechin on 28 October 1847 (the Feast of Ss. Simon and Jude) by Bishops Skinner, Russell and Terrot, in St. Andrew's, Aberdeen. He was consecrated along with Alexander Ewing, the first Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, whose diocese had been separated from Moray and Ross. [39] Immediately prior to his consecration Forbes signified his adherence to the eighteenth-century concordat between the bishops, which was the basis for episcopal collegiality. This promised he would not consecrate anyone as bishop without the prior consent of the majority of the bishops, and that "in all matters relating to the Church, Worship, and Discipline thereof, we shall be determined by the same majority". Originally the agreement of the bishops of the eighteenth-century diocesan party, this concordat had been adhered to by all bishops since 1741. [40] It gave expression to the centrality of episcopal authority and solidarity which had been won free from royal control in the 1740's. At the consecration service Forbes was in such ill-health that few thought he would be capable of much work and would only last five years. [41]

Dean Horsley, the joint-incumbent of St. Paul's, Dundee, had died that October, and Forbes was elected in his place, since Scottish bishoprics still needed the income of a congregational charge. There had been an Episcopal congregation in Dundee since Robert Rait and Robert Norrie had been deprived as Episcopalian parish ministers of Dundee in 1689. The history of the congregation during the eighteenth century reflected the wider divisions between Episcopalians during that

century. There had been a schism over the Scottish Communion Office and the usages and another congregation was formed, which lasted until 1745, when the two reunited. In 1749 there was another schism when some of this reunited congregation broke away to form a qualified congregation. These two groups remained separated until 1829, when they merged under joint incumbents, and met in the Castle Street chapel, which had been built in 1812 for the congregation in communion with the bishops. [42]

In 1847 St. Paul's congregation numbered around one thousand, with three hundred and fifty communicant members. It included some of the leading families in the area, a number of English middle class immigrants, some hereditary lower class Episcopalians, and a number of Ulster Irish. [43] The congregation seems to have maintained some contact with the poor and the artisans of the city. Of one hundred and thirty seven marriages celebrated in the Castle Street chapel between 1817 and 1847, fifty six, or approximately one third, were illiterate and made only a mark as their signature in the register.* Occupations were rarely listed in the marriage registers before 1848, being given partially in only nine years during this period. Those given include three labourers, a shipmaster, weaver, mason, blacksmith, and an army corporal. [44]

The congregation Forbes found when he arrived in Dundee in 1847 was a congregation emerging from former obscurity, and growing in middle class membership and respectability since its merger in 1829 with the former qualified

---

* This figure includes only those who actually made a mark. In some entries no one other than the officiating minister signed the register, and others where only the witnesses did.

congregation. In Castle Street the chapel itself was surrounded by the masses of labouring poor, but the richer and more influential members lived completely separated from them, except when they came to worship on Sundays. However, Forbes did not follow this example of other members of the upper classes in Dundee. He moved into the city centre, to a house in Springfield Place, where he lived until moving in 1853 to Burnfield House off the Seagate. [45] In February 1853 the vestry of St. Paul's agreed to the offer from one of their number to sell a site on Castlehill for £1255, in order to build a clergyhouse on it. The vestry borrowed the cost from Forbes. [46] The building of the clergyhouse on Castlehill enabled him to live with his assistant curates and other priests in a form of celibate priestly community - the sort of collegial life that Pusey had always advocated for ministry to the urban poor. As well as the curates, the basic household consisted of a cook-housekeeper and a maid, while James Nicolson, incumbent of St. Salvador's and later Dean of the Diocese, also lived there. Guests more often stayed in a hotel at Forbes' expense because of the limited accomodation. Forbes did not entertain in the usual sense of giving dinner parties. He seldom accepted invitations to dine, except by close friends in the area, and occasional luncheons were the usual mode of entertaining at the clergyhouse. [47] The house was a place of privacy for Forbes where he could relax among close associates, and pursue his scholarship. Although he thought the house gloomy, it was his refuge from the demands and squalor of the city. The previous bishop had lived in Brechin, as pastor to the congregation there. Forbes' move into Dundee was a conscious decision to place himself at the population centre of his diocese. In fact his move into the centre of the city placed him among the crowded tenements and slums of the poor. His previous experience at St. Thomas', Oxford and at Leeds had undoubtedly convinced him that there was nowhere else he could live and reasonably expect to pastor the poor. His move was indicative that the

poor of the city would be of particular concern to him. In doing so Forbes set a unique example among Episcopalian clergy, and one that was still uncommon even in the Church of England. It was certainly unique among bishops in either England or Scotland, and set a powerful and attractive example to Anglican clergy and laity in both countries. Forbes was the only one of the seven Scottish bishops to live in such surroundings. The Bishop of Glasgow, the only equivalently industrialized city in Scotland, pleaded his wife's health for his frequent residence in Tunbridge Wells, and his successor chose to live in the more salubrious conditions of Ayr. To understand the radicalism of Forbes' choice of home it is only necessary to consider the comment of a social historian of mid-Victorian Britain.

> The slums of the cities terrified respectable mid-Victorians. Unless strongly motivated by philanthropy, public service or the spirit of adventure, they never went into them if they could help it. Often they had little idea what the city slums were like inside. It was one thing, a perfectly manageable thing, to visit the homes of the rural poor....Town slums were, reputedly, unsafe to visit without a police escort. [48]

Forbes chose not only to visit the slums but to live among them, separated later from the surrounding tenements and dark closes only by the height of Castlehill.

The presence in Forbes' congregation of Irish and English immigrants was a reflection of Dundee's growth. Dundee was one of the Scottish towns most affected by the industrialization of Scotland during the nineteenth century through its rapidly growing linen industry, and later from the jute industry which began effective production around 1850. Up until 1830 most British were not town dwellers, but by the end of the nineteenth century this had become the case in British society. Not all urban growth was as a result of industrialization, (Brighton, for example, grew rapidly during the 1820's as a result of the growth in recreation). Nor was all industry urbanized, with many industries being sited near coalfields. But where industrialization and urbanization went together such large towns were in the

forefront of the change towards a modern, industrialized society. For the first half of the century this was particularly true of the spinning mills of the textile industry. These have been described as "the advance guard of the factory system" and therefore as "the birthplace of the industrial proletariat". [49] Although Dundee's linen industry generated significant outwork, performed outside the factory, the jute industry was a factory production from the start. By the 1850's the textile industry generally ceased to expand and was surpassed by metal-working and engineering as the leader in industrial change. But in Dundee, because of the new jute industry, industrialization continued to directly contribute to urbanization after 1850. Therefore Dundee remained one of the nineteenth-century cities where the connection between industrialization and urbanization kept the city at the forefront of the emerging industrial society. This placed Forbes at the cutting-edge of the transformation of British society.

In Dundee in 1811, even with the boost of the Napoleonic Wars, there had been only four spinning mills. [50] The real change came in the 1820's with the arrival of large-scale steam-powered machine spinning, which meant mills were no longer limited by accessibility to water-power nor by the amount of power a water mill could provide. It also made economic sense to be in close proximity to markets and shipping, so mills began to be located in the town itself and to grow in size. [51] This in turn led to greater urbanization as mill owners began to need an increased labour force, living within walking distance of the mill. By 1832 there were upwards of thirty flax spinning mills in Dundee employing some three thousand persons. [52] The population of the town had risen accordingly, from 12,000 in 1766 to 30,000 in 1821, 45,000 in 1831, [53] and in 1841 it reached 63,000. [54]

Such extensive industrial growth and population increase produced widespread changes in the society of the city. There were very few hereditary noble families in Dundee and so the millowners became a sort of local aristocracy. [55] By the middle of the century these owners and the rest of the upper classes had left the city itself for the cleaner air and better sanitation of Broughty Ferry, three miles to the east. Influenced by the new industrialists, Dundee became a stronghold of the Liberal party, like much of Scotland during the nineteenth century before the rise of the Labour party. From 1832 until 1902 the city returned solely Liberals to Parliament for its two member contituency. Liberals also predominated on the town council, the Parish Council and later, the School Board. It has been characterised as a "cautious, limited, but genuinely progressive" Liberalism on social issues. [56]

While the middle classes grew to provide such services as clerks and managers for the mills and shipping, by far the biggest change in society was the immigration into the town of unskilled labourers and semi-skilled workers needed for the factories. In 1832 the thirty spinning mills had a working population of three thousand, of which over fifty percent were children. These, and their adult co-workers, worked a twelve and a half hour day, excluding meals, from 5.30a.m. to 7.00p.m. The wages of these mill workers ranged from the skilled mill-wrights receiving 14-18s. per week, to women on 5-8s. and children just 3-6s. [57] The Dundee workforce was largely female (approximately a third to a half of those under twenty five), and the millgirls were characteristic of the city. [58] Coarse of language, and exhibitionist in behaviour the mill girl was "instinctively committed to a rigorous hedonism". These women workers constituted an identifiable subculture in the city streets. [59] Women were commonly found occupying prestige jobs such as weaving and spinning. Weavers, men and women, were the superior echelon of an industrial caste system. Their work in the factory was cleaner, more skilled and

more permanent than the spinners, next in the hierarchy. The position of women in the workforce in such large numbers was the result of the policy of the millowners, as they regarded women as more manageable. Dundee was not a city where men were the normal breadwinners among the working class. They were often unemployed and dependant on the wages of their women. [60]

The growth in manufacturing brought an influx of Irish. In 1840 there were seven thousand Irish in Angus, most of them in Dundee. By 1861 their numbers had doubled, boosted by the Irish Famine of the 1840's. [61] The jute industry's historian argued that the city only attracted Catholic Irish and that there was no effective Orange movement. [62] But the statistical returns of Brechin diocese for 1847 estimated that the numbers of Irish who attached themselves to the Episcopal Church was approximately 2000. [63] While this figure is for the whole diocese, it is likely that these Irish immigrants congregated mostly in Dundee itself where there was work in the mills, rather than in the smaller towns and countryside. In an Episcopal congregation in Dundee estimated in the same return as just 1000 members this would have been an overwhelming proportion, even if most of the Irish did not attend worship. There was widespread anti-Catholic prejudice in Dundee, even to refusing the Irish poor relief to which they were legally entitled, although once again not as vociferous as that in Glasgow. [64]

The arrival of such large numbers of workers, either from other regions of Scotland or from Ireland, meant fundamental changes in social conditions in Dundee. Housing them all produced overcrowding in the central areas close to the mills. [65] The unsalubrious overcrowding produced disease and there was a typhus outbreak in 1819, cholera outbursts in 1832 and 1833 and smallpox in 1833. [66] The poor and the manual labourers, of all sexes and ages, sought solace not so

much in religion as in drink. In the eighteenth century drunkenness had been mainly an upper class phenomenon because alcohol was expensive. But in 1794 cheap licences were instituted for shops selling only whisky, and after 1832 lower duties made spirits even cheaper and easier to buy. [67] One minister of the Church of Scotland in Dundee commented that "the whisky shops are most numerous and pernicious". [68]

All this could not fail to have some effect on the Churches in Dundee, although at this time their attitude was largely approving and complacent towards the new industrial and urban conditions. The Revd. James Thomson, minister of the Cross parish of Dundee, was hardly critical of these fundamental social changes and certainly not of the mill owners whose paternalism he commended. Writing of Dundee's industry in the *New Statistical Account of Scotland* in 1845 he believed that: "generally speaking, there does not appear to be any operation connected with it [linen manufacture] particularly prejudicial to health, unless it be too long hours of labour, to which some of the youth of more tender years are no doubt exposed". [69] He then contradicted his optimism by suggesting the establishment of a fund from employees and masters for those whose livelihood was threatened by severe accident "for not a year passes by without accidents occuring to both old and young persons employed about machinery". [70] However, aside from this implied criticism, the mill owners were commended for their concern. The blame for any misfortune and lack of morals fell mostly on the workers themselves, or on parents for sending children into the mills. [71] If this leading minister of the Established Church is a reliable guide, the Churches in Dundee at the middle of the century supported the city's industrialization and the benefits of *laissez-faire* capitalism. Thomson complimented the mill owners on their educational initatives, although the *New Statistical Acccount* gave the number of mill schools as just five,

teaching reading, writing, arithmetic and "sometimes geography" to what the *Account* estimated were about five hundred pupils. [72] Thomson concluded: "after every drawback, however, persons visiting the mills and manufactories will see with pleasure the appearances of health and cheerfulness every where exhibited". [73] If this was the response of one of the ministers of the Church of Scotland, with his wider access and knowledge of Dundee society at all levels, then it is unlikely that the pastors of the small Episcopal chapel would have been any different.

The Church of Scotland in Dundee, however, had begun to respond to conditions in the growing city. In 1830 it established a City Missionary Society and raised £160 for its work employing four missionaries in daily house to house visiting among the poor. [74] The Episcopal Church had no such involvement. Internal matters, such as the building and financing of their chapel, took up most of the energy of the Dundee Episcopalians. Certainly their poor relief was comparatively low. In 1831 St. Paul's congregation gave £30 for relief of their own poor. This compares with £75 for the Old Baptist congregation whose size was approximately a hundred people less. [75]

Forbes endeavoured to raise the profile of the Episcopalians in Dundee. Within two years of his arrival in Dundee Forbes' Tractarianism motivated him to propose the building of a new church to his congregation, in a sermon preached in 1849. This was probably delivered in February, as by early March William Forbes was already informing Gladstone of the project which, he said, would be cathedral-like and have schools attached to it. [76] Forbes proposed to raise a "real, consecrated church". He was obviously unhappy with the Castle Street chapel, with its furnishings indicative of the liturgy of the eighteenth century and not of the centrality of eucharistic worship so important to the Tractarians. The Dundee

chapel was upstairs from a bank, furnished in accordance with the contemporary sparse ceremony of the Episcopal Church. There were green baize covered pews, the pulpit and the prayer desk were as prominent as the altar, which was covered in red velvet all the year round; and the service conducted by the priest in black preaching gown. [77] Forbes said in his sermon that the meanness of the chapel had been appropriate to the position of the Episcopal Church during the previous century, when it had been a scattered remnant of its former self. But since their legal toleration, Forbes asserted, there had grown up a lethargy among them. "Is not the Church regarded as an easy religion, very creditable to belong to, the faith of the aristocracy of the country, not making any great demands upon our comforts, our purses, or our principles?" Forbes proposed to make such demands by building a new church which would be "a standing creed", testifying to orthodox doctrine by the very form of its architecture and evidence of the sincerity of the congregation's religious convictions. As such the church would also be "the great mart where all men meet as equals, and where the just and natural distinctions that exist outside are merged into equality before the omnipotence of God". Forbes went on to testify to the importance he attached to eucharistic worship and the sacraments, by describing the proposed church as an acknowledgement of "the great doctrine of the blessed Presence of Jesus Christ within the Church...communicating to us His sacred manhood in the Sacraments of the new law". [78] He finished with a caution to the congregation not to allow the financial demands of the new building to lead to neglect of present duties towards their poor. [79] The link between orthodox belief and Christian practice expressed in the new church was one Forbes had made even more explicitly the year before, when he preached the sermon at the consecration of St. Columba's in Edinburgh.

> It has pleased God, in some way to us unknown, to bind together holy living and right believing. However different the sources in the soul, whence these spring, they are nevertheless united in their consequences. They act and re-act

> upon each other; either tends to produce the other. Thus, an orthodox faith finds its co-relative on a high and exalted standard of practice; while lax views, with regard to what Christians believe, are in general accompanied by low notions of what they should do. [80]

A holy life and a true faith were, for Forbes, intimately connected in a "golden bond". While the building of a new church was an expression of right belief, that belief would invariably lead to serious and demanding Christian action. The process also worked in reverse. Holy worship would lead to holy belief, and to holy lives. He evidently hoped that the congregation, rich and poor, would find within the walls of the church during worship a common identity as members of the Church. As the son of aristocratic Tories, Forbes accepted that in mundane society there were right and proper differences of degree. But these, he hoped, could be set aside during worship when membership of a higher, divine society was expressed. Forbes implied that if such an ideal could be realised, it would attract the surrounding poor to worship. Once they became church attenders, the impact of the worship and their surroundings would attract them into becoming regular, orthodox believers. It was the same connection between worship and evangelism expressed later in the more famous slum ministries of English Anglo-Catholic ritualist clergy in the 1850's. [81]

Money began to be raised after the preaching of this sermon, which was printed by the vestry to assist the cause. By March 1852 George Gilbert Scott had been commissioned as the architect and William Forbes was telling Gladstone that his brother considered Scott's designs "most beautiful and that it will be the finest building in Scotland of modern times". [82] Gilbert Scott at this time was becoming renowned as the greatest exponent of the gothic revival in architecture, and the decision to employ Scott was apparently Forbes', for later the same month he was being complimented on his choice. [83] The original tender for the new church was

£8500, but this proved too rich for the vestry's blood and a lesser one of £6033 was finally accepted from Scott, which involved deferring work on the tower and the interior. [84] However Forbes was asked to write to Scott to ask for further modifications to enable the cost to be reduced to £5000. A compromise was reached and the foundation stone was laid on 21 July 1853. [85] Funds toward the new church were also raised at the vestry meeting on February 1853 by agreeing to the sale of the existing chapel to the Princes Street Independent Congregation for £1250. [86] There was a dispute between the two congregations later that year over the proposed position of the organ in the new church. The Congregationalists objected to the organ being put into the west-end gallery as this would enable it to be heard by them in the old chapel. An agreement that September repositioned the organ in the north transept. [87] Forbes had his aesthetic sensiblities offended by the clash between the new gothic church and the eighteenth-century church plate of the congregation. He told the vestry much of this was "almost useless" being poorly designed, and he obtained their agreement to recast much of it to "obtain vessels better suited for Divine Service". [88] In May 1854 Forbes delightedly reported to the vestry that he had accepted from Dr Anderson of Newburgh an old font, which had supposedly been the font of the medieval church at Newburgh. [89]

The new church was finally ready to be opened at the end of December 1855, by which time it had cost £11000, exclusive of the site itself. It was built on Castlehill, the site of the old medieval castle, so that it towered over the city and was reportedly the highest church in Scotland at the time. [90] Compared with the eighteenth-century liturgical furnishing of the old chapel the new gothic church highlighted the altar. In company with other Tractarians like Thomas Chamberlain at St. Thomas', Oxford, Forbes had striven to erect a church where the liturgical space reflected the prominence of the eucharistic celebration. As he had told his

congregation in proposing the project, the new church would be the place where the eucharistic presence of Christ was communicated to them, and where all men were equal in the sight of God, if not in the eyes of each other. Forbes was also giving physical expression to Pusey's ideal of reviving parishes as eucharistic communities which could reach out to embrace the urban poor. It was an ideal realised not just in the building, but also in the more frequent celebrations of Holy Communion Forbes instituted.

In preparation for the opening service Forbes wrote to Walter Kerr Hamilton, the Bishop of Salisbury, to invite him to be the preacher. Hamilton was the second Tractarian bishop to be consecrated, and the first in the Church of England. Forbes felt the presence of a bishop of the Church of England would assist in overcoming Episcopal divisions. He explained: "there is a class of persons who neglect to hear the Church in this country on the plea of our not being identical with the Church of England". [91] Forbes' description of the objectors as those who "neglect to hear the Church in this country" suggests that it was those who separated themselves into so-called chapels of the Church of England in Scotland that he hoped to encourage into the Episcopal Church. If a bishop of the Church of England were present at the opening of the new church, and thereby testified to his recognition of the Episcopal Church, Forbes believed such people would realise the futility of their objection to the Episcopal Church. But Hamilton was evidently unable to come and instead Bishop Robert Eden of Moray was the preacher for the service on 13 December 1855.

The cost of the building, and the consequent indebtedness of the congregation, necessitated the continuance of pew-rents in the new church. There is no evidence of how Forbes felt about this but it is probable he agreed with Pusey

that pew-rents were undesir able as acting as a barrier to church attendance by the poor. However, Forbes acknowledged that the fabric was the reponsibility of the vestry, and so rents were set between five to forty-two shillings a year. [92] It is difficult to see how else the vestry could have met the cost incurred, as there were no endowments or other sources of income save that of the giving of the congregation.

Forbes' concern for the poor was also emphasized by his pastoral visiting. Living where he did meant he became a familiar figure in the area, and therefore he was unlike the usual middle or upper class philanthropist who visited the poor but lived elsewhere in more congenial surroundings. No doubt this made Forbes' ministry more authentic to the labouring poor. While he visited every member of the congregation, his greatest task was visiting the masses of unchurched poor in the city's tenements. His cousin, Francis Skene, believed he became popular with the city's poor through his practice of visiting patients in the infirmary, regardless of their denomination, and the record of admissions to the Royal Infirmary give some idea of the scope of Forbes' contact with the poor. [93] For the first ten years of his ministry Forbes, or one of the other clergy at St. Paul's, made 188 recommendations of admission, some of whom were readmissions. Of these 114 patients were born in Ireland, 59 in Scotland, 10 in England, and 6 were born elsewhere or their place of birth was not recorded. Most lived around the centre of the city but a number came from outlying Lochee. Predominantly the patients were weavers or millworkers but there were significant numbers of winders and domestic servants. Other workers included washerwomen, factory workers, labourers, shoemakers, loom workers; also a watchmaker, schoolmistress, cutler, tailor, turner, housewife, seaman, and a sailmaker. There were also nine children. Of the total referrals 98 were women, most of whom were employed. [94] These numbers

represent only those ill enough to be hospitalized, but they indicate that Forbes and the St. Paul's clergy had extensive contact with the labouring poor. If this contact derived from their pastoral visiting and not from contact initiated by the poor themselves, as seems likely, then the clergy's work took them all over the city. The high proportion of Irish among those referred by the Episcopal clergy suggests that Forbes and his clergy in Dundee were in the habit of visiting the poor and working classes, or otherwise having contact with them, irrespective of their denomination. Certainly some of the Irish would have belonged to the Church of Ireland; but many of those referred were among the poorest, unskilled workers from whom the Church of Ireland had little support. It is likely therefore that a proportion of the Irish referred to the Infirmary were Roman Catholics. Such contact contrasts with the anti-Irish feeling and Catholic prejudice common at the time. But his visiting down filthy streets and in unsavoury tenements cannot have come easily to Forbes, who read Dante with Gladstone; whose sensibilities were heightened by gothic architecture; and whose health was always delicate. For those who knew him this substantial personal involvement with the labouring poor made Forbes' example all the more powerful. His sister Elizabeth, undoubtedly in admiration of her older brother, testified to the impact his life in Dundee made on her. Writing of her visits to Dundee she said:

> When I used to be there after a day of district visiting in the slums of Dundee his great refreshment was a Canto of Dante - which we read together - He was an excellent linguist both ancient & modern & he had the greatest pleasure in Antiquarian lore & with it all surprised us by keeping up so much with the literature of the present day. What I admire so much in his character was the self-sacrifice, for his love of refinement & beauty...would never have fixed upon the money making town of Dundee for a home. [95]

However, despite the pastoral labours among the city's poor they do not appear to have translated their respect for Forbes into significant church attendance. One of his curates, George Grub, remembered that during the 1870's the

congregation consisted chiefly of wealthy families from the outer areas of Dundee, and that it was the "better class of Church folk throughout the town" who mostly made up the worshipping congregation. [96] Perhaps Forbes' sermons were partly to blame as he tended to make these more learned than was the wont of the labouring poor, because of his concern for doctrine. His younger brother, George, teased him about his frequent quotes from Aquinas. [97] In 1857 Forbes confessed his bewilderment to George about the weak hold the teaching of his Church had on his people. He felt "the native Scotch mind looks upon us as a sort of illogical popery" and he was unhappy at the increase in the congregation due to mixed marriages, which seemed to him to be growth through marriage and not necessarily conviction. [98]

Like his father and grandfather before him Forbes became actively involved in the civic affairs of the city he lived in, and did not confine himself to strictly ecclesiastical concerns. Forbes' involvement with the infirmary was not limited to referring the poor. He was periodically appointed as the infirmary's official house visitor and served on its weekly committee. St. Paul's also supported the infirmary with annual donations and in 1851 Forbes was appointed a life governor. [99] As well as the Royal Infirmary, in April 1848 he was present at a meeting in the town hall for those interested in the establishment of model lodging houses for the labouring poor. The meeting resolved that existing conditions for the accomodation of the labouring poor were wretched, crowding together men, women and children in ways injurious to their health and exposing the respectable among them "to many risks and temptations". Therefore a subscription would be raised to support lodging houses which would be comfortable, economical, run by "strict superintendance" so as to exclude "disorderly persons", and be models for the common lodging houses. It was thought that the labouring poor who were

"industrious and respectable" would resort to using such model lodgings in preference to existing unsanitary accomodation and this would force inadequate lodging houses to improve their physical and moral conditions. [100] It was as much the danger to the moral life of the respectable, deserving poor as the threat to their physical health that the meeting had in mind. By 1850 two model lodging houses were established, one each for men and women. A second house for women was added in the mid-1850's but only lasted a few years. Forbes served on the committee of management of the Model Lodging House Association from 1856 until the end of the 1860's. [101]

The major social project of these early years of Forbes' episcopate was the establishment of the Baldoven Institute. This was a mental asylum for children built on the estate of Sir John Ogilvie, modelled on the work of Dr. Guggenbuhl of Interlaken. Ogilvie was the senior Liberal member of Parliament for Dundee and a member of St. Paul's congregation. Forbes had been associated with his wife, Lady Jane Ogilvie, in the foundation in 1848 of a rescue home for prostitutes in the city known as The Home. In December 1855 the Ogilvies called a meeting at Baldoven of those interested in the asylum. Work had already begun on the building and they desired to make it known publicly and to decide on its future management. The meeting included Forbes, the Ogilvies and five others. These formed themselves into a committee of management to which were added four others, including Professor Alison of Edinburgh and Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. An appeal for funds was launched and a board of directors formed, of which Forbes was a permanent ex officio member by virtue of the feu disposition of Sir John Ogilvie. In addition to the mentally disturbed children, the institution also included provision for orphans and other destitute children of the Episcopal Church, who were housed in the same building but under different care. "The advantage of having such

children to be companions for the imbecile children during their play hours, when they have advanced to a certain stage of cure, need hardly be pointed out" claimed the prospectus. [102] The Institute opened in January 1854 and by March had seven patients. [103] Forbes was very much involved with it, and subscribed annually. He searched out suitable housekeepers; prepared the directors' reports; frequently chaired their meetings when Sir John Ogilvy was absent; and was annually elected one of their Visiting Committee.

It is difficult to be sure to what extent these projects originated with Forbes. Whether or not he was the author of these schemes it is certain he would not have got very far without the support of the influential Liberal establishment of the city, as represented particularly by Lord Kinnaird and Sir John Ogilvie, both Episcopalians. George William Fox, eighth Baron Kinnaird, was an agricultural reformer and a philanthropist. He established schools, reading rooms and libraries on his estates and assisted in the foundation of industrial schools throughout the county. A Liberal peer and a free-trader, he was a friend of David Ricardo, and also of the Radicals Richard Cobden and John Bright. [104] His younger brother, Arthur Kinnaird, was the Liberal M.P. for Perth and a fervent Evangelical. Both men were on the board of the Royal Infirmary and Forbes probably owed his early appointment as a life governor to their influence. These important figures must have been extremely helpful in attracting support for the various philanthropic projects the bishop was concerned with. Forbes was a close friend of both families, but his influence may well have owed most to their wives. Lady Ogilvie's philanthropy has already been mentioned. Lady Frances Kinnaird was a supporter of some of the more Tractarian projects of Forbes, such as the sisterhood he founded in 1871. She also had the billiard room at Rossie Park converted into a chapel along Anglo-Catholic lines, complete with a stone altar. [105]

Forbes' involvement with the social needs of Dundee was underpinned by his concern for social cohesion. This can be illustrated from a sermon he published in 1853 called the *Duties of Society*. He emphasized the basic bonds of human society as the brotherhood of all human beings by virtue of their being children of God, having a common creation. More importantly, the unity of all humanity in society was to be found in Christ who, as the incarnate Word, united to himself all human nature. [106] While the mission of the Church was not, for Forbes, primarily a civilizing one, such an effect was an important consequence of the preaching of the gospel. [107] The natural weakness of humankind meant a necessary mutual dependence but, he asserted, there had been a perversion of this "holy principle" in the egalitarian principles of the French Revolution, which went beyond Christianity. However, the French Revolution did bear witness to one great principle in that it "asserted in the most open terms, that every man has claims upon his fellow, - that mutual support, and comfort, and sustentation is a right of existence, - that each one is his brother's keeper". [108] Claims to a levelling of social differences did not meet with Forbes' approval, clashing as they did with his Tory upbringing and also with his Tractarian sense of hierarchy. However he did strongly object to those philosophies, such as political economy, which denied or curtailed the sense of philanthropy by the well-off towards the disadvantaged. Socially, Forbes retained the Tory paternalist outlook of his father. Like most of his contemporaries Lord Medwyn was influenced by political economy, advocating savings banks as a means of reducing dependence on the poor rates. But even more fundamentally he was a representative of the old eighteenth-century "moral economy",* where poverty was

---

* The phrase used by Gertrude Himmelfarb in *The Idea of Poverty* (1984), and derives from E.P.Thompson's, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century", in *Past and Present*, (1971).

regarded as a natural, if unfortunate condition, which the wealthy in a Christian polity had an obligation to relieve, because the poor were equally members of society. Alexander Forbes shared these views in which wealth and social position were part of the natural order of things, but these privileges brought with them an obligation towards the poor. Almsgiving was "the duty and end" of the rich and without it riches would lead to damnation. [109] Christian society was interconnected by bonds of dependence and moral obligation, and its members therefore should understand and appreciate their common unity as creatures of God and as members of the Church. His membership of the Model Lodging House Association was an indication that Forbes, like the prevailing political economy, was concerned for the deserving poor. But his readiness to visit the very poor in Dundee, and to refer them to the infirmary, is evidence of his willingness to relieve the non-deserving as well. Nowhere was Forbes' distance from the principles of political economy, with its disdain for the non-deserving poor, demonstrated more clearly than in his practice of the indiscriminate giving of alms. Beggars were wont to gather around the front door of St. Paul's in the confident hope of money from the bishop when he emerged after morning prayer. When one of the clergy remonstrated with Forbes' almsgiving, on the grounds that the beggar was a "humbug", Forbes merely replied, "If I were as poor as he is, I should be a humbug too". [110]

Coming from a Tory family Forbes was a steady supporter of Gladstone, at this time still a Peelite Conservative, in his Oxford University constituency. In 1853 he made a trip to Oxford from Aberdeen specially to vote for Gladstone. [111] But Dundee was a Liberal city and Forbes' ability to get on with the leading figures of the Liberal establishment was partly testimony to his personal charm, which was often remarked upon by those who met him. But it must have been congenial to

Forbes that some of the Dundee elite were aristocrats, for he had a Tory attachment to the importance of aristocracy in a civilized society. [112] But Forbes thought that since the 1830's the rise of the middle classes had incited the upper classes to become more public-minded - what Forbes termed "their increased regard for the duties of their station" - causing the aristocracy to rise in the public estimation. [113]

Forbes was never very radical in his social criticism, except when he thought the rich were deserting the social obligations their privilege entailed. When this occured Forbes could express the anger of a paternalistic Tory at the desertion of the moral economy. Then Forbes could be very scathing indeed towards the wealthy, as he had no illusions about the combination of wealth and spiritual zeal, nor about Victorian respectability.

> The rich are even more apt to neglect Him[Christ] than the poor, though they may not violate the outward decencies, and may think some profession of religion to be necessary to their station. You know what the SAVIOUR has said about the danger of riches. It is easier to be damned in a drawing-room than in the flats of a factory. There is more peril to the soul in the refinements of polite society, than in the heated atmosphere of the crowded workshop, or in the coarse relaxations of the village green. [114]

Forbes shared the familiar Tory paternalist outlook of many of his contemporaries among the bishops. Two things, however, distinguished Forbes from both the English and Scottish bishops. First was his Tractarianism. Secondly, there was his first-hand involvement with the labouring poor. Both of these mitigated his sense of satisfaction in the present hierarchical order of society. His Tractarianism taught him that the Church was a divine society not always in agreement with the surrounding secular society. As Forbes mentioned to his congregation when building the new church, there was an equality of membership within the Church. This understanding of ecclesiastical society was at variance with the values of secular society expressed in pew-rents. Forbes' involvement with the poor helped him

realise the undeserving poor could not be ignored. It also taught him that assistance towards the poor could not simply be on the level of private charity, but needed a more organised approach. At this time his involvement with such organised help was aimed at alleviation rather than change, but this level of aid was perhaps the most immediate reaction engendered in mid-Victorian Britain by the plight of the poor.

Forbes' acceptance of hierarchy in society was mirrored in his belief in hierarchy within the Church. Ecclesiastical society had its own hierarchy, in which the clergy predominated over the laity, and the clergy themselves were ranked from the bishop downwards. Forbes was not expressing anything new in this belief, it was a commonplace among Episcopalians as demonstrated by the anxiety of the northern bishops over the possibility of lay representation in synods earlier in the century. To Forbes, as to most Episcopal clergy, the crucial difference between clergy and laity in the Church lay in the authority over spiritual matters given to the clergy by virtue of their ordination. Forbes' exaltation of ordained authority was revealed in a clash with the vestry of St. Paul's in 1853. The congregation of St. Paul's had been experiencing difficulty over the repeated absence of Torry Anderson. Anderson was joint—incumbent of the congregation, a position that originated in the union with the qualified congregation in 1829, when it had been decided that both priests of the two separate chapels should be joint-incumbents in the merged congregation. This arrangement had continued ever since. Anderson had been one of the supporters of the other candidate at the episcopal election in 1847 and Forbes evidently found him difficult to work with, for he used to refer to Anderson as his "moral hairshirt". [115] Eventually, in October 1853 the vestry passed a minute expressing "pain" at Anderson's continual long absences, and also at his residence outside Dundee. They agreed this was inconsistent with someone

who had no duties other than to the Dundee congregation. The whole matter had been brought to a head by the absence of both Forbes and Anderson the previous Sunday so that there had been no morning service. [116] A copy of the vestry minute was sent to both incumbents. This prompted such a reply from Forbes that it moved a meeting of lay members of vestry in January 1854 to pass a motion expressing regret "that any act of theirs could bear the construction of being an interference on their part towards government in Spiritual things". [117] Forbes' attitude to the division between the work of the laity and the authority of the clergy is made even clearer in a letter he wrote to the vestry in October of the same year, regarding the bishops' decision for a national collection to raise money for the education fund. Forbes sought the vestry's approval for the collection to be taken up in St. Paul's. He did so, he explained, because "I am always most scrupulous in recognizing an office of the Vestry in that which pertains to them, viz in regulating the temporalities of the Congregation". [118] In Forbes' theological understanding the laity could not trespass into the area of spiritual authority which pertained solely to the clergy. The laity had a role in temporal matters of building, finance and the like, but it was ordination which gave authority over doctrinal and other spiritual matters. For Forbes this also meant the laity could not challenge the clergy, except in mundane matters. His attitude to the respective roles of the clergy and laity was one area where Forbes' Tractarianism reinforced the tradition of the Episcopal Church. But his view of the role of the laity in the Church came under increasing pressure as more Episcopalians became supporters of greater lay involvement in the affairs of the Church.

Forbes had already had cause to oppose William Gladstone on the issue of lay representation in the Episcopal Church's synods. By 1850 Gladstone had relinquished his former hopes for the Church of England and had settled for it

being given sufficient freedom from parliamentary control to pursue its mission of converting the nation. He also looked to the non-established Episcopal Church as being freer than the Church of England to give a Catholic lead to Anglicans. But he thought it would be a stronger Church, with greater support and a better defence against erastianism, if it included the laity in its counsels. [119] In his *On the functions of Laymen in the Church* published in 1852 Gladstone proposed that a third chamber of laity be added to the General Synod, consisting of communicant laymen, but with the initiation of all legislation remaining in the hands of the bishops. Bishop Forbes got wind of this proposal before it was published and in January expressed his fears about it to Gladstone. "I confess", he wrote, "I dread it much in a body where there is so little dogmatic faith - and tho' I should have less difficulty about the apportioning of monies, or even the judicial trial of scandals etc, yet I see much risk in the attempt." [120] Forbes' anxiety was for doctrine, fearing the effects of an untheologically-educated laity voting on questions of dogma. Forbes also was not prepared to have the laity trespass into what he regarded as the spiritual prerogatives of the clergy. This attitude owed much to the sacerdotalism of the Oxford Movement but, in Forbes' case, it was motivated more by a concern for the maintenance of dogmatic truth than by a sense of clerical privilege. Forbes told Gladstone he was prepared to countenance the laity judging the clergy in non-spiritual matters, such as conduct and finance. But this contrasts with his rebuke of the vestry of St. Paul's the following year when they drew attention to Torry Anderson's absence from the congregation. This was surely the sort of area for lay involvement Forbes was conceding to Gladstone, but in practice was not willing for his vestry to exercise. It suggests that Forbes was not really comfortable even with the degree of lay involvement he conceded to Gladstone, but was only reluctantly willing to compromise with those over whom he had no control, as long as it did not endanger the clerical monopoly over doctrine.

William Forbes told Gladstone that his brother was "very strong" on this matter. [121] In fact that Forbes wrote a pamphlet on Gladstone's proposal in the form of an open letter to the primus, William Skinner of Aberdeen. It was published under the psuedonym of "Cantus", and demonstrates Forbes' skills as a controversialist. [122] He criticised Gladstone's proposal as motivated by expediency and proposed to answer him on the "test of principle". The crux of this principle was that spiritual authority was invested in the principle of hierarchy and was incompatible with democratic government. Spiritual authority, he argued, was personal, deriving from the person of Christ. Even the present government of the Episcopal Church realised this personal spiritual authority only imperfectly, because its hierarchy lacked an archbishop. Although as a Tractarian he was less than enamoured with the Reformation, he suggested that Gladstone's proposal intimated that the English Reformation had been deficient with regard to lay representation and episcopal government. Also, if the synods of the Church were opened up to the laity it would be only those with the necessary means who could attend. This, according to Forbes, would leave the Church at the mercy of the better-off, an undesirable repetition of the situation of the sixteenth century when the Church of Scotland was controlled by nobility, the so-called Lords of the Congregation. Forbes was attempting to create the fear that lay involvement would lead to lay control and so to the end of episcopacy. Further, Forbes claimed that Gladstone's proposal would undermine the legitimacy of the Scottish Episcopal Church, which he saw as rooted in the practices of the early Church, an early Church which, he argued, had no such lay involvement. [123] The controversial aspects aside, the pamphlet illustrated that Forbes considered the Anglican Church had its own *magisterium*. This teaching authority was given only to the clergy by virtue of the authority imparted to them by their ordination, and safeguarded by their theological training. The Church was divided into the discerning and

instructing clergy (*ecclesia docens*), and the passive receiving laity (*ecclesia discens*), whose assent to the doctrine taught was a necessary and vital component of the assurance of its truth.

In August 1852 Forbes ensured that his own diocese opposed Gladstone's plan, by using his casting vote to pass a motion against any alteration in the present constitution of the Church. [124] Only Aberdeen was also opposed to the proposed change, although other dioceses wanted it referred to a General Synod. The bishops, however, did not see fit to call one and the issue lapsed for the present. Forbes' brother, William, remained convinced that economic stringency would force the Church to look for wider lay support. "We have too long been looking to the £10 of Dukes' & Earls'", he wrote, "& this plank has notably failed & we feel that the earnest middle class is the body to whom the temporal affairs of the Communion is to be entrusted". [125]

As a diocesan bishop Forbes was not always an upholder of the *status quo*, but encouraged his diocese to meet other contemporary challenges. When he became Bishop of Brechin his diocese consisted of eleven charges, totalling 3069 members, with sittings for nearly 3000. The largest of these was St. Paul's, while the new church at Fasque was the smallest, with only 55 members. The numbers of those attending Holy Communion each year were even less. In 1847 there were just 1710 for the diocese overall. [126] With the increasing population one of his priorities as bishop was supporting church extension, and his first involvement in this area was the consecration of a new church at Catterline in 1849. [127] By 1851 Forbes had initiated and licensed a new mission in Dundee out of his own congregation, which later became St. Mary Magdalene's, Blunshall Street, with a new church built in 1854. [128] Along with church extension went the establishment

of church schools. These were opened at a faster rate than new churches, as most existing congregations lacked their own school. By March 1854 Forbes had ensured there were four Episcopal schools in Dundee, and there were seventeen day schools throughout the diocese. [129] The following month another was opened at Lochee, a large manufacturing area on the southwestern edge of Dundee, where Forbes had established another mission congregation. [130] The Dundee schools included two at St. Paul's, one attached to St. Mary Magdalene's and one at Bonnet Hill, as well as that at Lochee. [131] By 1851 the diocese had appointed three clergy as its school inspectors. [132] In 1855 Forbes opened an Episcopalian training centre for schoolmistresses in Dundee. [133]

Forbes also had pastoral matters within the diocese to attend to. In 1849 he heard a charge of "aggravated conviviality" against the priest of Catterline and judged it not proven, allowing him to return to his congregation. The priest later appealed successfully to the Episcopal Synod and was found not guilty. [134] The same year Forbes was writing to William Gladstone about his desire to have an alternate use of the Scottish Communion Office and the English liturgy at the Fasque chapel, built on the Gladstone estate. Apart from Gladstone's parents, Forbes explained, all the rest of the congregation were used to the Scottish office as Fasque was the only chapel in the Mearns to use the English rite. Forbes said he foresaw "heavy days in store for the whole Anglican Communion" so he could not "help wishing to strengthen so far as in me lies, the cause of Catholic truth". Once again he was expressing his preference for the Scottish Communion Office over the English office because he thought its eucharistic doctrine preferable, and more faithful to patristic precedents. [135]

An early diocesan project of Forbes' was the foundation of an agricultural college. In 1851 he wrote to Arthur Gordon of Aberdeenshire, a potential benefactor, about his hopes to establish such a college in the diocese or at Aberdeen. Forbes planned to bring in boys from two or three neighbouring congregations, or even from further afield. The bishop was obviously thinking of the state of Episcopal poor in agricultural areas for he went on to explain, "their habits are little better than those of the presbyterians & when they go out to service & encounter the ridicule which their profession exposes them to, they too often fall away from all religion". Forbes was concerned not only with the piety of Episcopalian agricultural labourers, but also that their poverty and poor social standing led them to shun church-going and to become detached from Christian faith. What Forbes wanted was to "found an institution which shall combine practical instruction in agriculture with a sound education in Christian principles". He informed Gordon that one of his clergy was already willing to manage the college in addition to his congregation. [136] The college was eventually opened at Drumlithie in November 1853 on two sites, under the care of Robert Thom, the local priest. The part known as "the Home" was a house in the village near the church and parsonage. Here the younger boys did light work on the farm or in the garden during summer. They were also taught reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, history, and the basics of farming and gardening. At another site on ten acres of land, known as "the Temple", the older boys farmed eight acres and practised gardening on the other two. All boys went to daily service and received moral instruction. Boy s were charged between £6 and £10 a year depending on their ages. In reporting the opening of the college (so-called from its communal nature), the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* reported that the establishment was undersubscribed by £300 and only two boys came from homes that could afford the fees. At that time there were eight boys enrolled, aged ten to seventeen. [137]

For all his social concern undoubtedly the pet project of Forbes' in his first years as bishop was the Diocesan Library. The library had opened in 1792, following a motion for its establishment at the diocesan synod of that year. The clergy were to pay two shillings and sixpence a year for its upkeep and it was originally housed in the home of the priest at Laurencekirk until a dedicated room was built in the chapel there in 1819. [138] By 1847 the library had received some valuable accessions, including seven hundred volumes from William Abernethy Drummond, Bishop of Edinburgh, at the turn of the century. Bishop Drummond had inherited by marriage the estate and famous library of William Drummond of Hawthorden, friend of Ben Johnson. [139] In 1821 another collection was begun at Brechin, as part of the Diocesan Library, following the bequest of six hundred volumes from the Revd. Alexander Jamieson of Glasgow. [140] By the time Forbes became bishop the library was described by its historian as "in a very flourishing and active condition...which says a good deal...for the quality and intellectual calibre of the Episcopalian clergy at this time". [141] Forbes had borrowed from the library during his appointment at Stonehaven and he was keen to see it continue to grow. In 1849 he gave the library the works of William Maskell, the High Church antiquarian, and those of Alexander Knox, the eighteenth-century precursor of Tractarian theology. [142] Forbes desired the two collections of the library should come together under one roof, in a library financed by himself to be built at Brechin. This scheme eventually went ahead and work was finished in 1854. The completed buildings, which still stand, included a combined library and chapter house for the meeting of the Diocesan Synod, a church school and a school house and cost Forbes £500. [143] The following year the synod met for the first time in the new building and the dean reminded them that they were "solely indebted to the Bishop's generosity" and grateful thanks were unanimously passed. [144] By building the library at Brechin, and by holding his diocesan synods there,

Forbes demonstrated his attachment to the medieval centre of the diocese, from which it derived its name, and perhaps intended Brechin to become its intellectual centre. If this was his intention it was not unrealistic. By the end of the century the library was recognised by the Stationary Office as an important national collection of scholarly material when it donated one of its surplus sets of state papers to the Diocesan Library, in company with other major research libraries throughout the country. [145] Forbes maintained his generous support of the library by a further donation of £100 in 1857, the interest of which was to be used in paying its running expenses. He also gave to its collection that year the works of Gaudentius, Gregory the Great, and Anselm. [146] Other accessions which the diocesan minutes recorded during these years included various works of Robert Wilberforce, William Palmer of Worcester College, Thomas Aquinas, an edition of the Scots Prayer Book, and various histories of the Scottish Church. Forbes did not donate all these works, but as a scholarly bishop library accessions would surely have had to meet with his approval. He was evidently concerned that his clergy be well read, particularly in patristic and scholastic theology, contemporary Anglican theology in the Catholic tradition, and in the history of the Church in Scotland.

As Bishop of Brechin, within the small community of the Episcopal Church, Forbes was one of the most powerful individuals in the Church. Since the securing of episcopal control during the eighteenth century the government of the Episcopal Church had virtually consisted of the bishops meeting as an Episcopal Synod. This power had reluctantly begun to be shared in 1811, when the clergy had been permitted to vote at General Synods. From the first Forbes was a supporter of episcopal authority, and always strongly upheld the nonjuring tradition of the power and role of the diocesan bishop. In 1850 he protested against the possible reintroduction into Scotland of a Roman Catholic diocesan hierarchy. He claimed,

upon the principle of the catholicity of the Episcopal Church, that it was contrary to the order of the Church for a second Catholic hierarchy to be superimposed upon an already existing one and that "all bishops, whether of great or small sees, are of one order and rank". [147] This understanding of episcopacy expressed by Forbes, of the equality of all bishops regardless of their see, was a central point of the Scottish nonjuring theology of the episcopate developed under Bishop Rattray. In the event, the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Scotland was not restored until 1878.

The same year brought a further opportunity for Forbes, as a member of the Episcopal Synod, to uphold the episcopate according to the nonjuring tradition. In April the synod heard the appeal of Charles Wagstaffe, incumbent of St. Andrew's, Aberdeen, against the sentence of Bishop William Skinner. Wagstaffe had been ordered by Skinner to desist from making changes in the liturgy, including the addition of an anthem. The priest continued his liturgical deviations and had consequently been tried by Skinner before his diocesan synod. Contrary to the opinion of the majority of the synod Skinner had found Wagstaffe guilty of disobedience. The Episcopal Synod upheld Wagstaffe's appeal although it censured him for his lack of "filial respect" towards Skinner, and found that he had erred in supposing his own discretionary power over the conducting of services enabled him to ignore the bishop's directions. Wagstaffe was also told to avoid being a stumbling block to the weaker members of his congregation. [148] The exact details of Wagstaffe's alterations in the liturgy are not given in the Episcopal Synod's records, but his inclusion of an anthem suggests that they were mild forms of ritualism. If this is correct then the case represents one of the first occasions in Scotland when ritualism was pursued in defiance of the wishes of the diocesan bishop. This was exactly the sort of tension Forbes had encountered during his

brief time at St. Saviour's, Leeds. However, unlike the Church of England, the authority of the Scottish bishops was sufficient to exercise real control over troublesome clergy.

The bishops understood that this case had focused particularly on the jurisdiction of the bishop and so they appended a lengthy Note to the minutes of the appeal to further clarify their position. In it they said that the authority of the diocesan bishop over his clergy consisted in "enforcing the observance of Canons & Rubrics, but also in superintending, and, if need be, controlling their conduct in such ecclesiastical matters as Canons & Rubrics have either not touched at all, or have touched upon imperfectly". The bishops recognized their own power was regulated by the canon law passed by General Synod. However, they claimed that the diocesan bishop was the initial interpreter of the canons and that further appeal could only be made to the episcopal college. With regard to a bishop delivering sentence against the wishes of the majority of his synod, the bishops declared the jurisdiction lay with the bishop and that the clergy were present only to give their opinion and advice. The bishops concluded their Note with a vote of thanks to the Anglo-Catholic lawyer, James Hope, whose opinion had been sought at Forbes' suggestion. [149] But unrest among the clergy at the monarchical power of the bishops was evidently growing. Forbes had previously written about the Wagstaffe case to his colleague, Bishop Torry of St. Andrews, explaining that it would not do for the bishops to settle it upon their "preconceived notions" for, "when I was last in the north I found a profound jealousy existing with respect to the justice of our awards". [150] This was obviously the reason for Forbes suggesting the outside opinion of Hope, although Hope's own Tractarian theology and personal inclinations (he became a Roman Catholic in 1851) would also have led him to exalt the bishop's office. The understanding of episcopal authority was one issue on which

Tractarian and northern Episcopalian saw eye to eye. Although the practice of later Anglo-Catholic ritualists was often to ignore the injunctions of their bishops against ritual innovations in worship, in theory they, and the earlier generation of Tractarians, were committed to episcopal authority as a distinguishing feature of Catholicity. Forbes had previously demonstrated at St. Saviour's his unwillingness to initiate ritual innovations in advance of his congregation's understanding. In regard to the Wagstaffe case Forbes sided with the bishops against a mild form of Anglo-Catholic practice, partly because Wagstaffe had upset the "weaker" members of his congregation, and, perhaps more importantly, because Wagstaffe flouted episcopal authority.

Caution on matters of liturgy and ritual was characteristic of Forbes' ministry throughout his time as bishop and pastor of St. Paul's. By 1871 the Sunday services during the morning featured Holy Communion at 8.00, and at 11.00 Matins, Litany and sermon, while once a month there was a choral celebration of Holy Communion. At 3.00 in the afternoon there was a choral Evensong (boys only) with a sermon and catechising, and during the winter a full choral Evensong and sermon which was popular. Despite a predominantly well-to-do congregation there were working class members. These went to Sunday Evensong and to the early Holy Communion. Matins and Evensong were said daily, and there was a celebration of Holy Communion on Thursday mornings and on saints days. [151] This was a similar regime to that of many Tractarian parishes in England, but it fell short of the daily Holy Communion and Sunday Sung Eucharist with elaborate ceremonial which was becoming the norm in leading ritualist parishes in England by 1870. [152] Forbes' caution about ritual was also evident in the furniture and ceremonies of St. Paul's. There were no candles on the altar, and the black gown was used by all preachers except Forbes who, as a bishop, presumably dressed in

his lawn rochet. Forbes had made a promise to retain the black gown for sermons when he had first come to Dundee. [153] One of the projects dear to Forbes was the installation of a marble reredos of Christ in glory which was added to the interior of the church in 1867. It appealed to the aesthetic side of his nature. Like all Tractarians, he blamed the lack of beauty in churches on the Reformation, commenting to his intimate friend and chaplain Roger Lingard. "what a vandal clearout there was in the Reformation". [154] The installation of the reredos suggests that Forbes would have liked more ritual if he could have got it, but was determined to go no faster in liturgical innovation than was likely to be accepted and understood by his congregation. Unlike the priests of some Anglo-Catholic slum parishes Forbes was not creating a parish out of virtually nothing. In a non-established Church he had to take into account the membership subscriptions at St. Paul's, funds which he could not afford to alienate lightly. In fact his caution over ritualism, and his appreciation of the native Scots dislike of anything that smacked of popery, caused him to be wary of the younger generation of the Catholic revival - referred to here as Anglo-Catholics - the more ardent ritualists found in the Church of England, and represented in Scotland principally by the English clergy of St. Ninian's cathedral, Perth. In 1859 Forbes inquired about the possibility of having a young ordinand from Cumbrae College come to Dundee as his curate. However, he stipulated that he "could not endure a grand English Puseyite & the very simple way in which we are here rather vitiates against any Englishmen". [155] His caution about ritualism could, at times, be severe. He positively forbade eucharistic vestments in the diocese because he considered that after the 1863 revision of the canons they were illegal in the Episcopal Church, but he did wear them in England where he considered they were permissible use. [156] He once ordered an incumbent to return a pair of candlesticks given for the altar to their donor. [157] Unlike many Anglo-Catholic sympathisers the ritual

Forbes did allow was not necessarily a copy of continental Roman Catholicism. To the end of his life he retained the practice of giving communion tokens to those of the congregation intending to go to holy communion, distributing them at the chancel step of St. Paul's. Forbes said he retained this old Episcopalian practice "as a last relic of church discipline". [158]

Forbes' prudence about ritualism contributed to the conversion to Roman Catholicism of one of his young Dundee clergy. William Humphrey, ordained in 1863, was incumbent of St. Mary Magdalene's (a Dundee mission church with a largely Orange Lodge Irish congregation). He became a Roman Catholic in 1868 and was later ordained a Jesuit. All his life Humphrey retained a vivid memory of Forbes, and in 1896 wrote a short book entitled *Recollections of Scottish Episcopalianism*, giving his recollections of his time in Dundee, of Forbes in particular, and of the events leading to his conversion. Although a partisan apologetic for Roman Catholicism it is the only extended account of Forbes from someone who respected him personally, but was hostile towards his position and beliefs. [159] After his appointment to St. Mary Magdalene's Humphrey saw a good deal of his bishop, remembering him as "a fascinating man, with most charming manners. His conversation was refined, instructive, and somewhat cynical". Forbes' cynicism was illustrated in a visit of Dean Ramsay's which coincided with Humphrey's stay at the Dundee clergyhouse prior to his induction to St. Mary Magdalene's. Afterwards, Ramsay wrote to thank Forbes for his hospitality but commented that he had observed one of the curates "foully murdering" a grouse at breakfast. When Humphrey took this personally he was consoled by Forbes sardonically remarking, "I fancy that good Mr. Dean values carving more than he does theology as a clerical accomplishment". [160]

Humphrey portrayed Forbes as a "timid man" who was a secret admirer of Roman Catholicism but too fearful to act sincerely on his beliefs. As an indication of this he told the story of his collaboration in Forbes' consecration of altar stones and holy oil which were then supplied to various Anglo-Catholic clergy elsewhere. Humphrey said he would buy the marble and the oil, which Forbes would then bless according to the Roman rite. Humphrey remembered that:

> Dundee was at that time regarded as an emporium of these sacred luxuries, by the more advanced members of the Puseyite party. Like Dr. Pusey himself, his disciple Dr. Forbes had not the most rudimentary conception of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Their idea of all that was necessary for the doing of episcopal or sacerdotal acts was possession of power of order, episcopal or sacerdotal, as the case might be. Just as Dr. Pusey was in the habit of making confession tours throughout the length and breadth of England, and giving absolution without receiving any faculties to do so from the Protestant Bishops within whose diocese he was sojourning, so was Bishop Forbes in the habit of exporting his holy oils and altar-stones into the dioceses of Bishops who would have regarded them as contraband. [161]

Humphrey condemned Forbes for a practice he himself was only too happy to participate in at the time, but which later proved a useful stick to beat Scottish Episcopacy with. But his criticism was valid, for it was uncanonical in the Episcopal Church, and contrary to its tradition of episcopacy developed in the eighteenth century, for a bishop to exercise his episcopacy outside his own diocese. However, it seems Forbes was content to usurp what properly belonged to other diocesan bishops in matters of Catholic ritual where the respective bishop was unlikely to be favourable.

Humphrey's own ritualism soon antagonised his congregation of Orangemen. They were scandalised, for instance, when in 1867, on a Sunday that coincided with the anniversary of the battle of the Boyne, he dressed the altar in a green frontal. [162] Inevitably this confrontational approach and Humphrey's extravagant ritualism divided the congregation. A deputation from the congregation called on Forbes who asked for their forebearance, promising to speak with Humphrey. For a

time these interviews seemed to help matters and it was eventually decided that Humphrey should become priest of a new mission church, and his resignation was announced in St. Mary Magdalene's in December 1867. But Humphrey made so many conditions about this new charge that Forbes ceased to continue the matter and the priest unilaterally rescinded his resignation. Humphrey's officiating at St. Mary Magdalene's the following Sunday morning caused a disturbance, and those objecting to him formed themselves into a separate congregation which met in the Kinnaird Hall. Forbes was deeply hurt by it all and had sleepless nights. [163] Humphrey at last resigned his charge on 12 March 1868 having, according to his own account, abruptly converted while on a visit to London to see a friend who had previously become a Roman Catholic. [164] He left behind him a permanently divided congregation because those who had separated themselves refused to return to St. Mary Magdalene's, so that in August 1868 Forbes was compelled to license their existence as a mission congregation. [165] Forbes' early experience had convinced him that confrontational ritualism could only antagonise a congregation and harm the Catholic cause in parishes. The difference in the attitudes to ritualism of the two men is best explained by Forbes' greater pastoral experience and sensitivity and by Humphrey's later conviction, at the time of writing his book, that Catholicism was identified with the Church of Rome.

Forbes' influence as a bishop was assisted by his links with prominent figures in the Church of England. One of the matters to come before the Episcopal Synod soon after Forbes became a member illustrates this continuing connection with important English Churchmen. An old Oxford acquaintance, William Palmer of Magdalen College, in his concern for reunion with the Orthodox Church, approached Forbes in 1849. Palmer had been in Russia where he had been asked by the Orthodox to repudiate various heresies they alleged were contained in the

Thirty Nine Articles, and he was seeking support for his action. Palmer made an appeal to the Scottish bishops because he held letters commendatory from Bishop Luscombe, who had been consecrated by the Scottish bishops in 1825 as a bishop for those in communion with the Church of England living in Europe. [166] However the bishops cordially declined to hear his appeal as being outwith their jurisdiction, Bishop Luscombe not being a member of the Episcopal Synod.

These two factors, episcopal authority and influential connections, came together during 1850 in a clash among the bishops over an edition of the Scottish *Book of Common Prayer*. It had been compiled by clergy and others sympathetic to the northern tradition, who sought and gained the authorization of Bishop Torry for the new edition. [167] They had used the 1764 version of Robert Falconer but amended it where necessary, making explicit reference by rubrics to the old liturgical usages revived the previous century. Forbes had known about the preparation of the edition since 1849 and it was eventually published the next year under the title of *The Book of Common Prayer...according to the use of the Church of Scotland*. Included in the published edition was a notice from Bishop Torry stating that it was in "strict conformity with the usage of the Church of Scotland; and I accordingly recommend it to the use of the clergy of my own diocese". [168] Patrick Torry was one of the last survivors of the Episcopal Church from its penal days. He was born in 1763 in Aberdeenshire and had been ordained priest in 1783. In 1789 he had gone to the congregation at Peterhead, where he remained incumbent until his death. Consecrated Bishop of Dunkeld in 1801, he later became Bishop of St. Andrew's, Dunkeld and Dunblane. [169] A firm adherent of the Scottish Communion Office, Torry was a living representative of the nonjuring traditions of the eighteenth century, and it was those very traditions which were at the heart of the ensuing struggle over the new prayerbook.

In April 1850 Forbes told his brother George, that he had received a letter from Charles Wordsworth, warden of Trinity College, asking about Forbes' involvement with the new prayerbook. Forbes commented that Wordsworth intended to make a row about it. [170] Wordsworth referred the matter to the Episcopal Synod, and the meeting in April passed a majority motion directing Bishop Torry to withdraw his "imprimatur". They resolved that the publication of a prayerbook calling itself the use of the Church of Scotland, without any sanction from General Synod, was "an instance of High presumption" on the part of the publisher and those who employed him, "and that the Sanction of a single Bishop, which has been obtained does not extenuate the offence". Forbes' dissent from this action was recorded in the minutes. The synod also resolved to write to the publisher of the prayerbook, requesting him to recall all copies and to suppress the remainder. [171] For the next five months there was a struggle, ostensibly about the right of a single bishop to issue a prayer book which claimed the authority of the Church. Underlying this issue, however, was a deeper tension about the place of the Scottish Communion Office. Bishop Trower of Glasgow in particular argued that the liturgical usages had been bartered away at the end of the eighteenth century in return for the Church's legal status. [172]

The struggle saw the influence of the Forbes' family used on the side of the prayer book because they were afraid that an attack on that could become a threat to the Scottish Communion Office. Lord Medwyn proposed to Bishop Terrot of Edinburgh that while the bishops could not recognize the book as an official publication, they should not request Torry to withdraw it and should say nothing against the usages. Medwyn thought that if this was done Torry could be persuaded to alter the title page and even his terms of recommendation. Medwyn also recognised that the issue drew attention to the differences between the Episcopal

Church and the Church of England and that this acted as a disincentive to many prospective lay supporters, "who otherwise might befriend a Church using the same Liturgy & Rites". [173] The printing of the prayer book in highlighting the Scottish Communion Office as a major difference between the two Churches was to Medwyn a "false move" which could pave the way for its complete abolition as being a "ground of division". [174] One of the book's compilers was in touch with his fellow protagonist, George Forbes, expressing the hope that because of the letters he had received from Bishop Forbes "the issue may be pretty safe". [175] He pinned his hopes on Bishop Torry standing firm and Bishop Forbes speaking out. [176]

In May 1850 William Forbes was militantly suggesting the circulation of the prayer book regardless and considering the possibility of a secession. [177] Later that month Alexander Lendrum, the priest at Crieff and another of the book's compilers, wrote to George Forbes about his recent conversation with Bishop Forbes. The bishop had assured him he would prevent any discussion on the prayer book, (presumably at the regular Episcopal Synod in September), "by refusing his sanction to open it up". [178] At the Brechin Diocesan Synod in August, William Henderson and Torry Anderson proposed a motion thanking the bishops for their "timely declaration" against the prayerbook, and asking them to take further measures to make it known that the book had no authority. An amendment was then proposed, thanking Bishop Torry for sanctioning the book "embodying the traditions and customs of the Church in Scotland"; regretting its censure by the bishops; but expressing the synod's regret at the present form of the book and its lack of adequate authority. The prayerbook had become a test of strength between two parties within the Diocese of Brechin. On the one hand were people like Henderson and Anderson, who were opposed to Forbes personally and to the

Scottish Communion Office because it distinguished the Episcopal Church from the Church of England. On the other hand were those who were proud of the distinctive traditions of Scottish Episcopacy. For the present the anglicizing party was slightly stronger and Henderson's motion was carried by a majority of one. [179]

If Forbes hoped to prevent discussion of the prayerbook at the Episcopal Synod that September he failed miserably. The bishops first issued an address to all Episcopalians dealing with three areas. Regarding the Episcopal Synod as a court of appeal, the bishops lamented the increase of legal argument which complicated questions. They next uncompromisingly reaffirmed episcopal authority which, they said, resembled "that of a Parent over his children". From their point of view one of the "least encouraging symptoms of the prevailing religious excitement" was "the disposition to forget this essentially fatherly character of the Bishop's office". They reaffirmed the jurisdiction of the bishops over the meaning of the canons, subject only to General Synod; and the jurisdiction of each diocesan bishop over his clergy as "the guardian of Christian Doctrine and Discipline". Thirdly, the bishops concerned themselves with the ritual of the Church, calling attention expressly to the rubrics of the recent prayerbook which they argued had no sanction, and they directed Church members against using it. They deplored the raising of divisive issues by the prayerbook as "likely to lead the mind rather to discussions of a ritual and ceremonial character than to the Eternal Realities which are the subject of Divine Revelation". [180] The bishops next composed a letter to all the bishops of the Anglican Communion repudiating the 1850 prayerbook. [181] Finally, they wrote to Bishop Torry, recalling him to the concordat he had signed at his consecration agreeing to abide by the wishes of the majority in matters relating to the Church, worship and discipline. They again urged him to withdraw his sanction

of the prayerbook. [182] Once again Forbes had his dissent from all these measures recorded in the minutes, but he had been unable to prevent their passing. He remained in a minority of one, as Torry was too aged to attend the synod.

Forbes did not think the prayerbook could survive this repudiation. He felt Torry had a right to publish the book, though not, to be sure, under the authority claimed on the title page. He wondered at Bishop Trower's attitude and asked his brother George, "how is it that every high churchman who comes down here in love with the Sc. Office goes over to the *enemy* in 18 months?" [183] William Forbes thought that Trower's antagonism to the book was guided by Wordsworth. As Englishmen, be believed neither of them could understand Scots. This is a significant comment coming from a member of the Forbes family who was one of the upper classes in Scotland that were so often raised to look favourably upon English life and influences. It is a further indication that, despite anglicizing influences, the Forbes family retained a sense of the distinction between Scots and English in a way not always favourable to the latter. William further commented to Bishop Torry that it was "hard however that [those] who come among us, like Bp. Trower, discontented with the position of the English Church, shd. desire to tye[sic] us hand & foot to that establishment". [184]

As in the Brechin synod, the struggle over the 1850 prayerbook was between those who valued the links with the Episcopalian past and those who valued conformity with the Church of England. It identified Forbes early in his episcopate as someone sympathetic to the northern tradition in its most contentious form, the Scottish Communion Office. To the tension over the Scottish Communion Office was added the bishops' concerns about "religious excitement". Their allusions to this excitement in their September synod address was connected with controversies

surrounding ritual. Their restatement of episcopal authority in the Wagstaffe case also suggests that the bishops, other than Forbes and Torry, were increasingly concerned about the effects of Anglo-Catholic ritualism in the Scottish Church. They felt that the religious excitement created by the Oxford Movement was having a detrimental effect on the peace of the Church. Tractarian support for the liturgical expressions of the nonjuring tradition in Episcopacy exacerbated the differences over the Scottish Communion Office, while the tendency among clergy like Charles Wagstaffe, and others influenced by Anglo-Catholicism, to ignore their bishops in pursuit of ritualist goals was beginning to appear threatening to episcopal control of the Church.

Bishop Torry died in 1852 and this doughty supporter of Forbes in the counsels of the bishops was replaced by an equally vigorous opponent. Charles Wordworth, warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, was elected Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, by a majority of one after he had controversially voted for himself.

In response to these varied issues that arose during his first ten years as a bishop Forbes was beginning to formulate his own theological understanding. His renewed contact with the nonjuring tradition had not caused him to diminish the dissatisfaction with nonjuring theology he had previously expressed in his article in 1846. In 1851 he wrote to his brother George referring to the classic Episcopalian writer on the eucharist, Bishop Patrick Jolly, and to Jolly's devotional manual on the sacrament. Forbes said he thought what Jolly had written was true, "but not the whole truth". [185] This dissatisfaction with what he understood as the incompleteness of nonjuring theology was reinforced for Forbes by the celebrated Gorham judgement of 1850. In March 1850, the Judicial Committee of the Privy

Council had upheld the appeal of a clergyman of the Church of England against his bishop, for refusing the clergyman induction into a parish because he denied baptismal regeneration. The decision created widespread anxiety among High Churchmen and Anglo-Catholics. On the one hand it seemed to them to contradict the Church's doctrine. Perhaps more important, however, a judgement on a doctrinal issue by a secular tribunal made the Church of England appear to be an Erastian institution instead of an independent, apostolic foundation. The Gorham judgement proved to be the catalyst that sent many Anglo-Catholics into the Roman Catholic Church, including Henry Manning, James Hope and the Marchion ess of Lothian. Forbes wrote to various English bishops, presumably to encourage them to speak out against the judgement, but found they would do nothing. He applied to Wilberforce of Oxford, Blomfield of London, and Bethel of Bangor, but only Hamilton of Salisbury was interested in Forbes' letter. [186] As ever, Forbes' concern was to safeguard doctrine, and he was grateful that at least on this issue the doctrinal concern was clear. "A Church *really* committed to laxity on such a point", he wrote, "cannot be a true one. Then it is a great comfort that the controversy is not on the other Sacrament [the eucharist], & so one's heart is not torn out of one by the mad impiety of our opponents." [187]

The matter came before the Episcopal Synod, after having had resolutions passed against the Privy Council decision by the synods of Glasgow and St. Andrews. The bishops unanimously passed a resolution expressing their sympathy with the concern of the clergy regarding the judgement. They asserted that the Gorham judgement had no authority in the Episcopal Church, and enjoined the clergy to teach baptismal regeneration in a series of five specific points. The fifth of these denied the need for any further action other than the present declaration. A remaining worry about the possibility of the Church's formularies being thought

inadequate brought together two strange allies. Forbes and Trower were united for the only time in an alternate resolution to the fifth point of the bishops' declaration in which they affirmed: "that the Doctrine of Holy Baptism is so clearly expressed in our Formularies, that although the fact of the late Decision has given occasion to the Present Declaration, we do not hereby mean to assert that the language in those documents is not precise & sufficient". Trower was obviously concerned that the formularies held in common with the Church of England should remain unquestioned. Forbes was afraid lest it be thought that the Thirty Nine Articles were inadequate expressions of Catholic truth, and therefore increase Anglo-Catholic anxiety about the Anglican Church.

The Gorham judgement stimulated Forbes to further reflection, in response to the crisis of confidence in their Church among many of the more Catholic members of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church. Forbes believed this lack of confidence in the Church could be met if there was a re-emphasis on the truth and definition of doctrine within the Anglican Church. In a book on the Nicene Creed in 1852, written in the light of the Gorham judgement, Forbes acknowledged the Oxford Movement had taught "deeper views of God's Truth", which had resulted, he thought, in "a desire for a more systematic theology" among Anglicans. This book was the most substantial work of theology he wrote during this period. It was intended as a text book for those beginning the study of theology and dedicated to John Keble in "profound reverence and affection". Probably because of this purpose Forbes merely rehearsed traditional scholastic theology. He nowhere made any mention of John Stuart Mill or other contemporary skeptical thinkers who were questioning the possiblity of supernatural knowledge in the first place. Those contemporary writers who were acknowledged were mainly historians, including the German Ignaz von Döllinger. Faith, for Forbes, was assent to dogma, divinely

revealed, but proposed to the would-be believer "on competent authority", that is, the Church. In keeping with the Tractarian emphasis on the Church as a necessary and divine institution in the economy of salvation, Forbes believed it had an essential role in transmitting the content of revealed truth, and that it had the authority to declare what is necessary to be believed for salvation. In the preface he explained how he believed the Church could best do this:

> Such a theology is at once the most reverent and the most satisfying; the most satisfactory, because a strict dogmatic theology tells us in very plain language, that after the human intellect is exhausted, it has not reached God. Men also have felt, that in an exact theology is the only sure guarantee for a theology of faith. Where matters have not been defined, men have greatly contented themselves with the lower view...And we ourselves have seen how the faith of our own Church, on the subjects that were left as open questions, has shrivelled and withered away. A definite expression of doctrine embodied in the symbolic books of a Church becomes the institution by which the idea is preserved and perpetuated. Had a dogmatic teaching been then prevalent, the movement in the last century would in all probability have taken a more satisfactory direction. [188]

Forbes attributed the failure of the Church of England in 1850 to uphold the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration as the consequence of its weak hold on Catholic doctrine during the eighteenth century. This resulted, he felt, in the Evangelical revival of that century being captured by Protestant theology. Partly in response to the Gorham judgement Forbes desired the development of what he called "an exact theology", meaning by that a precise and dogmatic Catholic teaching by the Church. This he considered to be not only an antidote to the Protestantism that denied baptismal regeneration, but also to what he referred to as taking the "lower view" of religious truth. He believed that unless people were taught the truth of supernatural revelation exactly and plainly, as being the teaching of the Church, they would opt for more naturalistic, nonsupernatural, rational explanations. These explanations, for Forbes, could not penetrate into the fullness of divine truth and were far less capable of leading Christians into awe and holiness as they realised what God had given to his Church. Forbes feared that

people would come to treat Christianity as a "philosophy, as an opinion, as an idea". [189] Exact theology was his response to the Gorham judgement, but Forbes also proposed it as a means to combat the increasing indifference in society towards the Church. One reason, he believed, why the Episcopal Church was not more successful in its mission to the Scottish people was because there was a lack of confidence that the doctrines taught by his Church were true and accurate expressions of divine realities.

> I believe that one of the many reasons why the true faith, in regard to the Church and the Sacraments, has not found the acceptance it ought among our countrymen, is this, that in asserting the right doctrine concerning them, we have not sufficiently dwelt upon their heavenly nature. [190]

In this sermon delivered in 1849 Forbes was probably responding to the high level of indifference, lack of church attendance, and even of Christian belief he encountered among the urban poor. Awareness of this lack of Christian practice and belief lay behind his criticism of industrial society in a sermon he published in 1862.

> Upon what a fearful substructure of practical atheism is the commercial success of this country founded! The creation of a God-forgetting, God-despising class seems the condition of our social advancement...None but the Clergy and those conversant with the poor can tell you the awful need there is of something to be done; how sin and guilt generate themselves in new and astounding forms and shapes; how the present generation of workers is really worse than that which went before...O what a duty this imposes on those whom GOD, by a special mercy, has not numbered among these classes! [191]

Forbes, then, believed the newly-urbanized cities desperately needed some form of mission to redress the lack of Christian practice and belief that he believed had been created by industrialization. He thought that the Church could recapture the adherence of the labouring poor by sacrificial living among them, coupled with a greater definition in Christian doctrine.

Forbes' confidence and support for dogma was the major influence of the Oxford Movement upon him. He had an almost sacramental view of doctrine as

being, in Newman's words quoted before, "a Mystery...*lying hid* in language". Like the English Tractarian leaders, Forbes believed that Catholic dogma conveyed supernatural truth. He also believed that if this dogma was taught with precision by the Church it would be a remedy against rationalistic liberalism, and disbelief and indifference among the urban poor. One consequence of this high view of doctrine was to give Forbes a horror of heresy. The connection he made between truth and morality meant he regarded heresy not only as sinful, but as immoral. It was, according to Forbes, "a dishonour to God to think of him other than as he has revealed himself". [192] The centrality of truth and error in his theology could have unhappy consequences. One of the most obvious was that it led Forbes into traditional Christian anti-Judaic expressions. He regarded the Jews as among those whose error caused them to be rejected by God for their obstinate rejection of the truth of Christ. The harshness towards the Jews in the Church's history he accounted for by the increasing awareness of the Church at the "heinousness of the guilt of the Deicides". [193] The error of the Jews was an example of their "stiff-necked Jewish nature, ever intense, ever bigoted". [194]

By the end of the 1850's, Forbes' anxieties about the lack of confidence in the Church's teaching among Church members, and the indifference toward the Church among the labouring poor, were increased by a growing awareness of the effects of biblical criticism and science. Forbes drew attention to these issues in two sets of sermons he published in 1857. He must surely have been aware of biblical criticism before this through Pusey, but the appearance of it in a homiletic form indicates that, by this time, Forbes felt sufficiently disturbed to be warning about the effects of biblical criticism among ordinary church-goers. He said that modern theories which regarded scripture as culturally conditioned, or applicable only to the period of history it was written in, were not to be listened to. The

knowledge of God in revelation, he said, could not be "improved upon" (that is, undergo development) like a steam-engine or a telegraph. The closer his hearers were to the letter of scripture, he advised, the closer they would be to divine truth. [195] Concerning science and the Bible, he cautioned that scripture was not given to teach scientific but moral truth, and the ways of God to men. Nevertheless, scripture was infallibly true. He considered that science and the Bible could not contradict each other, proceeding as they both did from the same divine source of all truth. However, if any conflict did arise Christians "must unreservedly succumb to the latter". [196]

As a complement to what he considered were the negative influences of doubt and indifference towards the Church's teaching, some of Forbes' other publications at this time were intended to deepen devotional life. He particularly wanted the clergy not simply to be devout, but also to exercise the characteristic Tractarian ministry of confession and spiritual direction. His concern for devotional life was a facet of the usual Tractarian link between belief and holiness, as Forbes had elaborated in his sermon at the opening of St. Columba's in Edinburgh in 1847. Some of these devotional works were translations of Roman Catholic works with the more explicitly Roman content removed, and there was an emphasis on self-examination, preparation for Holy Communion, plus mention of ascetic practices. The use of Roman Catholic manuals, and the emphasis on self-examination points to the influence of Pusey, who pioneered the use of both in Tractarian spirituality. Pusey regarded asceticism as a necessary preliminary to sanctification, but as he had no one to guide him in the traditional ways of Catholic ascetical practice his personal grief at the death of his wife in 1839 increased the strain of mortification in his spirituality. Pusey's was a theology of the cross, meditating particularly on the passion of Christ. But his spirituality relied

too heavily on minute personal examination and an acute awareness of personal sinfulness which encouraged the use of corporal penance and voluntary humiliations. It was indicative of this scrupulous strain of spirituality that Pusey had begun to translate devotional material from seventeenth-century France, when the French Church had been influenced by Jansenism. The same tendency in Forbes towards excessive scrupulousness and worry over his self-worth had already been marked by Pusey himself. When Forbes was elected bishop he had produced a paper expressing sentiments which may simply have been traditional expressions of spiritual humility. However Pusey was anxious enough about Forbes' strong condemnations of himself to ask Keble what he thought of them. Pusey was particularly concerned that his own "general confessions of sinfulness" might have been unduly influential upon Forbes. [197]

The later years of Forbes' episcopate were those of the greatest growth in Brechin Diocese. Among the new churches built after 1857 were Broughty Ferry, Drumlithie, a chapel at the Kinnaird's estate of Rossie Priory, St. Salvador's, Dundee, and Laurencekirk. Even more schools or chapel-schools were established, including those at St. Salvador's, Laurencekirk, Catterline, Lochee, and the Cove. By 1871 St. Paul's, Dundee, had a day school, a night school for working class boys, and a sunday school. [198] Forbes was constantly endeavouring to extract more money for the schools from St. Paul's vestry. [199] The diocesan statistical returns also demonstrate this growth during Forbes' episcopate, which of course coincided with large-scale emigration into Dundee and surrounding areas resulting from the industrialization of the city. In 1847 there had been just eleven congregations in the Diocese of Brechin. During 1875, the last year of Forbes' life, returns came from nineteen congregations, including five from Dundee itself. Whereas membership totalled 3769 in 1847, by 1875 it was 11,363. Communicant

numbers were 1710 in 1847, and 3929 in 1875. But this later figure is, in part, accounted for by the increase in the frequency of services of Holy Communion by 1875. Whereas in 1847 only one congregation - St. Paul's, Dundee, - celebrated Holy Communion more than quarterly, by 1875 all congregations had a service at least monthly. In 1847 there were no returns made for schools. Such returns did not commence until 1855 when there were schools in all but one of the twelve congregations. By 1875 schools existed in fourteen congregations - four with Sunday Schools only, nine had day schools, and three also had night schools. [200] In his concern for church extension Forbes frequently turned to his wealthy friends for financial help, partly because he believed Brechin was the poorest of the seven dioceses, and partly because, as he once told Gladstone, he did not get much help from the landowners in the diocese. [201]

Forbes' involvement in the civic affairs of Dundee also continued to grow through the 1860's and into the 1870's. He was keen to establish a convalescent hospital. [202] He joined the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in 1864 and became a director of the Albert Institute (the forerunner of the city's museum and art gallery) in 1870. [203] The same year he also became a committee member of the Free Library, zealously soliciting books for the library from his friends and acquaintances, such as the historian John Hill Burton. [204] During August 1872 Forbes was present at a meeting to establish the Prison Aid Society in Dundee, and was elected to its committee. [205] The following year he became concerned that the Society address the great increase in juvenile crime in the city. [206] In 1873 Forbes also became a member of the Dundee School Board, and formed the Association of Church Choirs in the city. [207]

But this later growth and involvement in diocese and civic affairs only built upon the fundamental characteristics of Forbes' Tractarian-inspired ministry which were already established by 1857. Following his exposure to Oxford Movement theology and spirituality at university, his ministry had been largely shaped in an engagement with urban society. His first ten years in Dundee re-emphasized Tractarian principles formulated during his time at Oxford and Leeds. Like his more famous English counterparts, the ritualist slum priests, Forbes adhered to the Church as a eucharistic community which included the poor, worshipping in a church where the design of the church building and the layout of its furniture clearly demonstrated its eucharistic emphasis. Forbes actively encouraged the development of an active, theologically well-read, yet prayerful clergy. He desired priests to be responsive to the needs of the poor, but also to the spiritual needs of their congregations and to be examples of holiness. In formulating his plans Forbes was assisted by his personal connections with influential figures in the Church and society. But probably his most powerful instrument was the attraction of his own example of living among the poor, and the energy of his pastoral work both within his own congregation and his diocese. In developing the spirituality of the clergy however, Forbes tended to emulate Pusey and provide material which tended to over-scrupulous self-examination. Forbes' Tractarian ministry gave a lead to those Episcopalians influenced by the Oxford Movement, and by virtue of his position he became the *de facto* leader of a new force in the Episcopal Church. In doing so he demonstrated an appreciation for the nonjuring tradition, being particularly enthusiastic for the central authority of the bishops and the Scottish Communion Office. But Forbes remained critical of the vagueness of nonjuring theology which did not, he believed, go far enough in teaching explicit Catholic truth. It was this concern for Catholic truth that was fundamental to his outlook. The Gorham judgement in 1850 was the catalyst that led Forbes to express his belief in

dogmatic theology as a solution to the doubt among Church members in the Church's teaching, and the lack of church attendance or even of Christian belief among the labouring poor. An exact theology would, he believed, by its clarity and accuracy, revive confidence among both groups in the spiritual truths taught by the Church. Fundamentally, when confronted by the challenges to Christian belief that were growing from intellectual doubt and urban indifference Forbes responded by appealing to authority. Following the old Episcopalian tradition, he supported the authority of the bishop against threats to the unity of the Church. Doubt, indifference and even disbelief could equally be combated, he believed, by a re-emphasis on the veracity and reliability of the teaching of the Church, expressed authoritatively as dogmatic theology. Such an appeal to authority placed Forbes among the most conservative in reaction to nineteenth-century difficulties of faith. However, as a Tractarian, Forbes' appeal was to the authority of the Church rather than the usual Protestant appeal to the infallibility of Scripture.

NOTES.

1. *The Gladstone Diaries, vol.iii 1840-1847*, (ed.) M.R.D.Foot & H.C.G.Matthew (1974) 644.
2. Ibid., 646.
3. Ibid., 646-7.
4. Ibid., 648.
5. H.C.G.Matthew, *Gladstone*, (1989), 3.
6. Ibid., 4-9.
7. Ibid., 4.
8. Marion Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*, (1966), 79-80.
9. *The Gladstone Diaries, vol.iii*, 479.
10. Ibid., 480.
11. Ibid., 579.
12. Ibid., 580.
13. Ibid., 618.
14. Ibid., 623.
15. Matthew, Op.Cit., 68f.
16. Perry Butler, *Gladstone Church, State and Tractarianism*, (1982), 164.
17. Perry, 38.
18. *The Gladstone Diaries*, vol.iii, 644.
19. Ibid., 645.
20. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, BrMs.4.1.2., 187-8.
21. *The Gladstone Diaries*, vol.iii, 649.
22. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, n.d.[Sept 1847], PH., PPCUP.5.40.
23. John Skinner, *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy*, (1818), 434.
24. W.Walker, *Life of Alexander Jolly and George Gleig*, (1878), 296-7.
25. W.Stephen, *History of the Scottish Church*, (1896), vol.ii, 572-3.
26. George Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, (1861), vol.iv, 185.
27. Walker, Op.Cit., 270.
28. Grub, Op.Cit., 128-130.
29. Walker, Op.Cit, 80.
30. J.M.Neale, *The Life and Times of Bishop Torry D.D.*, (1856), 112-3.
31. Ibid., 115.
32. Grub, Op.Cit., 182f.
33. Walker, Op.Cit., 356.
34. Grub, Op.Cit., 174.
35. Ibid., 180-1.
36. R.Foskett, "The Episcopate of Daniel Sandford," in RSCHS., vol.xv, (1966), 152.
37. William Walker, *Three Churchmen*, (1893), 20.
38. A.P.Forbes, *Prisoners of Craigmacaire*, (1852), 4-5.
39. REC.II., 28 October 1847, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 149-150.
40. REC.I., SRO., CH.12.60.1, frontispiece.
41. J.Nicolson, *In Memoriam*, (1875), 5.
42. SPC., draft of an article on St. Paul's, Dundee, for the *Scottish Churchman*, March 1930, by Dean Christie.
43. Perry, 40.
44. SPC., Registers of Marriages, Scots Episcopal Chapel, Castle St., 1817-47.
45. *Dundee Directory*, (1850), 35. & (1853), 92.
46. SPC., vestry meeting, 30 March 1853.
47. G.Grub, *My Years in Dundee with Bishop Forbes*, (1912), 48-49, 55.

48. Geoffrey Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain*, (1971), 60.
49. F.M.L.Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society*, (1988), 22-3.
50. NSA., vol.xi, 26.
51. Enid Gauldie (ed.), *The Dundee Textile Industry: 1790-1885*, (1969), xx.
52. NSA., vol.xi, 26.
53. Ibid., 19.
54. Sydney & Olive Checkland, *Industry and Ethos:Scotland 1832-1914*, (1984), 46.
55. NSA., vol.xi, 20.
56. W.Walker, *Juteopolis*, (1979), 52.
57. NSA., Op.Cit., 26.
58. Walker, *Juteopolis*, 13.
59. Ibid., 19-22.
60. Ibid., 40-45.
61. Ibid., 114.
62. Ibid., 121.
63. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, BrMs.4.1.2., 193.
64. Walker, *Juteopolis*, 118-121.
65. NSA., vol.xi, 20.
66. Ibid., 2.
67. Checkland, Op.Cit., 83.
68. NSA., vol.xi, 52.
69. Ibid., 28.
70. Ibid., 29.
71. Ibid., 29.
72. Ibid., 45.
73. Ibid., 29.
74. Ibid., 43-4.
75. Ibid., 43 & 49.
76. W.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 5 March 1849, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.369.
77. Perry, 40.
78. A.P.Forbes, *Haggai's Mission:a sermon*, (1849), 8-9.
79. Ibid., 14.
80. A.P.Forbes, *Jesus our Worship:a sermon*, (1849), 5-6.
81. See L.E.Ellsworth, *Charles Lowder & the Ritualist Movement*, (1982).
82. W.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 12 March 1852, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.393.
83. A.B.Hope to A.P.Forbes, 14 March 1852, Eeles Papers, LPL.1543, f.81.
84. SPC., vestry meeting, 12 August 1852, Vestry Minute Book, St.Paul's Episcopal Church, Dundee, 1852-
85. SPC., vestry meeting, 27 September 1852, Ibid.
86. SPC., vestry meeting, 30 March 1853, Ibid.
87. SPC., vestry meeting, 14 September 1853, Ibid.
88. SPC., vestry meeting, 5 September 1853, Ibid.
89. SPC., vestry meeting, 3 May 1854, Ibid.
90. SEJ., January 1856, 19.
91. A.P.Forbes to W.K.Hamilton, 7 August 1855, PH., Ham.6.59.1.
92. SPC., vestry meeting, 8 November 1855, Op.Cit.
93. F.M.C.Skene, A Memoir of Alexander, Bishop of Brechin, (1876), 14.
94. Dundee Royal Infirmary Registers, 1848-1857, DUL., THB.1.4.1-2.
95. E.Forbes to W.Skene, 5 November ?1875, SAUL.19.5.152.
96. G.Grub, *My Years in Dundee with Bishop Forbes*, (1912), 12.

97. G.H.Forbes to A.P.Forbes, 18 October 1862, BrMS.1.3.667.
98. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, 20 August 1857, SAUL.19.2.157.
99. *Reports of the Dundee Royal Infirmary*, 1849-1876, DUL., THB.1.1.3-5.
100. *Dundee Lodging House Association*, (1848), DCL.308(19).
101. *Dundee Directory*, 1850-75.
102. Baldoven Minute Books, 1853, DUL., THB.8.3.1., 11-12.
103. Ibid., 1854, 14.
104. DNB., (1892), vol.xxxi, 191-2.
105. George Grub, *My Years in Dundee with Bishop Forbes of Brechin 1871-1875*, (1912), 58-62.
106. A.P.Forbes, *The Duties of Society*, (1853), 7-8.
107. Ibid., 10-11.
108. Ibid., 13.
109. A.P.Forbes, *Suffering*, (1853), 113.
110. T.Ball, "Recollections of Bishop Forbes and of Dundee Two and Thirty Years ago", in *The Scottish Standard Bearer*, vol.ix, (1898), 116-7.
111. W.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 12 January 1853, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.417.
112. A.P.Forbes, *A Commentary on the Litany*, (1855), 109f.
113. Ibid., 120.
114. A.P.Forbes, *Sermons on the Grace of God*, (1862), 227.
115. G.H.Forbes to A.P.Forbes, 3 August 1859, BrMs 1.1.178.
116. SPC., vestry meeting, 7 October 1853, Vestry Minute Book, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Dundee, 1852-.
117. SPC., meeting, 19 January 1854, in Vestry Minute Book, Ibid.
118. SPC., A.P.Forbes to Thomas Nicolson, 3 October 1854, Ibid.
119. Richard Shannon, *Gladstone 1809-1865*, (1982), 221.
120. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 8 January 1852, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.204.
121. W.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, 8 October 1852, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.401.
122. Mackey, 224.
123. Cantus[A.P.Forbes], *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus of the Church in Scotland, on the subject of the Rt. Hon. W.E.Gladstone's proposal to admit the laity into the Synods of that Church*, (1852).
124. Brechin Synod Minutes, 4 August 1852, BrMs.4.1.3., 28.
125. W.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 23 February 1857, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.436.
126. Statistical returns 1847, Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, BrMs.4.1.2., 193.
127. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 1 August 1849, BrMs.4.1.3., 1-2.
128. Ibid., 22.
129. SEJ., (1854), 71.
130. Ibid., 95.
131. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, BrMs.4.1.3., 24 & 35.
132. Ibid., 23.
133. Perry, 74.
134. REC.II., 5 September 1850, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 209.
135. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 11 December 1849, Gladstone papers, BL.44145, f.198.
136. A.P.Forbes to A.Gordon, 28 October 1851, Aberdeen Papers, BL.43247, f.231.
137. SEJ., (1854), 63-4.

138. "The Brechin Diocesan Library: Its History and Collections". Talk given on the Brechin Diocesan Library by John Barker, Librarian of the University of Dundee to the Abertay Historical Society in January 1988. BrMs.4.2.14(8), 1-3.
139. Ibid., 4.
140. Ibid., 7.
141. Ibid., 8.
142. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 1 August 1849, BrMs.4.1.3., 1-2.
143. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 2 August 1854, BrMs.4.1.3., 35-36.
144. Ibid., 1 August 1855, 41.
145. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, BrMS.4.1.3., 17.
146. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 5 August 1857, BrMs.4.1.3., 50.
147. Grub, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol.iv, 272.
148. REC.II., 17-19 April 1850, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 194.
149. Ibid., 194-8.
150. A.P.Forbes to P.Torry (copy), 21 February 1850, SRO., CH 12.12.2409.
151. Ibid., 24-5.
152. L.E.Ellsworth, *Charles Lowder and the Ritualist Movement*, (1982), 38-9.
153. Grub, *My Years in Dundee*, 26.
154. A.P.Forbes to R.Lingard (-Guthrie), n.d., SPC.I.
155. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, 23 July 1859, BrMS.1.6.74(ii).
156. F.M.C.Skene, *Alexander, Bishop of Brechin*, (1876), 20.
157. Perry, *The Oxford Movement in Scotland*, (1933), 84.
158. J.Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office*, (1922), 225.
159. W.Humphrey, *Recollections of Scottish Episcopacy*, (1896), 15-18.
160. Ibid., 38.
161. Ibid., 39-40.
162. Ibid., 36.
163. J.Nicolson to A.F.Irvine, "New Years Day" 1868, PH., BpF.
164. Humphrey, Op.Cit., 40-44.
165. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 16 September 1868, BrMS.4.1.3., 142-3.
166. REC.II., 4 September 1849, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 183.
167. Letters of R.Campbell to A.P.Forbes, May-September 1849, SAUL.19.1.64-5, 69-79.
168. Grub, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol.vi, 266.
169. Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland*, 63f.
170. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, postmarked 10 April 1850, SAUL.191.99.
171. REC.II., 19 April 1850, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 203-4.
172. R.Campbell to G.Forbes, 26 April 1850, SAUL.19.1.106.
173. W.Forbes to P.Torry, 13 September 1850, SRO., CH.12.12.2411.
174. J.H.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d.[1850], SAUL.19.1.115.
175. R.Campbell to G.Forbes, 14 April 1850, SAUL.19.1.101.
176. R.Campbell to G.Forbes, 24 April 1850, SAUL.19.1.105.
177. W.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, 5 May 1850, SAUL.19.1.108.
178. A.Lendrum to G.H.Forbes, 19 May 1850, SAUL.19.1.150.
179. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 7 August 1850, BrMs.4.1.3, 18-19.
180. REC.II., April 1850, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 212-218.
181. Ibid., 219.
182. Ibid., 220.
183. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d.[1850], SAUL.19.1.114.
184. W.Forbes to P.Torry, 13 September 1850, SRO., CH.12.12.2411.
185. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d.[1851], SAUL.19.1.127.
186. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 1850, PH., PKiii.

187. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, 10 April 1850, SAUL.19.1.99.
188. A.P.Forbes, *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, (1850), vi-vii.
189. A.P.Forbes, *Commentary on the Litany*, (1855), 105-6.
190. A.P.Forbes, *The Christian's Foundation*, (1849), 12-13.
191. A.P.Forbes, *Sermons on the Grace of God*, (1862), 226-7.
192. A.P.Forbes, *Litany*, 61.
193. Ibid., 138.
194. A.P.Forbes, *Are you being Converted?*, (1857), 71.
195. Ibid., 75.
196. A.P.Forbes, *Amendment*, 143.
197. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d.[23 October 1847], PH., PK.ii.
198. Grub, *My Years in Dundee*, 35.
199. SPC., vestry meeting, 25 September 1869.
200. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 1847-1875, BrMS.4.1.3.
201. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 8 April 1859, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.234.
202. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, postmarked 14 September 1860, BrMS.1.7.125.
203. A.H.Millar, *Jubilee of the Albert Institute 1867-1917*, (1917).
204. A.P.Forbes to J.Burton, 21 January[1873], NLS.9399, f.217.
205. *Dundee Advertiser*, 5 August 1872.
206. *Dundee Advertiser*, 17 September 1873.
207. Mackey, 198.

4

CONTROVERSY AND TRIAL.

Forbes gave his first episcopal charge to his clergy at his diocesan synod of 1857, on the theology of the eucharist. He had chosen this subject for his primary charge out of a desire to uphold Tractarian doctrine on the eucharist at a time when similar teaching was on trial in the Church of England. But he was also motivated by a concern to continue to present the Church as a trustworthy guide to religious belief. The charge initiated what became known among Victorian Episcopalians as the eucharistic controversy. The controversy ran for three years, until Forbes was presented for heresy by one of his clergy, and eventually tried before the Episcopal Synod in March 1860. The opposition to Forbes' teaching drew in the other bishops, and large numbers of the clergy and influential laity. One of the fundamental reasons for the opposition was High Church suspicion of Tractarianism, as leaning towards Roman Catholicism. This opposition was itself exacerbated by the Scottish bishops' fear of alienating sympathy within the Church of England if the Tractarian teaching of Forbes was allowed to go unchallenged. The links with the Church of England were also valued by the anglicized laity of the south, and the bishops feared a split within their own Church. But neither Forbes' supporters, nor the opposition, were a cohesive group. His clergy in the Diocese of Brechin were either personally loyal to a man they found attractive, or were among the minority of northern clergy who thought the Oxford Movement a

continuation of their own nonjuring tradition. Supporters influenced by the Oxford Movement were divided. Some, like Forbes himself, looked to the older Tractarian leadership and were less willing to be confrontational towards prevailing Protestant attitudes. Others, generally younger clergy, wanted explicit Catholic teaching and worship and a greater contest with Anglican Protestantism. These two loosely collected groups of supporters and opponents came into increasing conflict during these three years. At Forbes' trial the argument depended on a difference over Anglican theological authorities, but underlying it was a contest for a theologically tolerant Church. It is one of the ironies of the eucharistic controversy that Bishop Forbes, the leading Tractarian figure in Scotland, should have directly caused the Episcopalian Church to become theologically more tolerant when, in fact, he desired it to be more dogmatic.

On Wednesday 5 August 1857 the clergy of the diocese of Brechin gathered in St. Mary's, Brechin for what would be the most significant synod of that small diocese during the nineteenth century. Bishop Forbes celebrated Holy Communion and told them that there would be no sermon as he intended to deliver a charge. He explained that it was too long to read in full but gave its leading points and said it was with his publisher who had instructions to send a copy to all his clergy. Forbes began by asking the question was Christ "really present" in the eucharist or not? The question, he maintained, was answered by the Church in the affirmative: the bread of the eucharist was the flesh of Jesus. It was answered by "the world" however, in the negative, denying any supernatural virtue and asserting the sacrament was merely a memorial. These two explanations, he said, had recently come into conflict in the Church of England. [1] He then endeavoured to establish the position of the Anglican Church on this question of the real presence of Christ. To do so he proposed to consult all the "authoritative documents" and not just the

Thirty Nine Articles. These authoritative documents he listed in five groups: 1. the articles and the catechism; 2. "the whole language of public prayers" i.e. the public liturgies of the Church; 3. the exhortations, directions and rubrics of the prayer book; 4. the early Church; 5. scripture as interpreted by the early Church, which he called the "paramount rule of faith" of the Anglican Church. [2] While individual members need not derive their faith from all these, the Church collectively must do so. Any official statement of faith not so derived could not be morally binding on Church members. [3] He then proceeded to demonstrate his claim that the Anglican Church taught the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist.

To defend himself against the possible accusation of teaching transubstantiation, Forbes claimed that the real presence could not be effected through transubstantiation, because it contradicted the very nature of a sacrament. Forbes believed transubstantiation meant there was no longer any natural part in the eucharistic elements but that the bread and wine ceased to be. In this, Forbes reiterated the classic Anglican objections made to transubstantiation since the seventeenth century. Basically Forbes thought transubstantiation to be a theory which went beyond the limits of rational thought, considering it was "not wise to apply human philosophy and human definitions to a profound mystery. We may not rationalise, but accept". [4]

He then turned to another prevalent theory of eucharistic presence, namely virtualism. [5] This was the belief that there is a real presence, but only of the virtue or power or grace of the body and blood of Christ to the believing communicant, while the eucharistic elements remained unchanged in substance. Although, Forbes acknowledged, this was the theology of the Nonjurors and some

of the significant figures of the Episcopalian past, he regarded it as inadequate. It did not do justice to the defence of a substantial or objective presence of Christ distinct from the faith of the individual communicant. The conflict between the defenders of virtualism and those, like Forbes, in favour of what they called the "Real Objective Presence" was to be one of the key tensions in the ensuing controversy.

Finally, Forbes commented on Article 29 which asserted "the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper". As against Forbes's argument that the Anglican Church maintained an objective eucharistic presence irrespective of the communicant's faith, this article could be interpreted in terms of receptionism. This was the belief that the the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist, but only to those who received the sacrament with faith. The presence of the Christ was therefore determined by the communicant's faith and not by the independent action of God's grace. Forbes quoted St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, who considered unworthy reception to be a serious matter, and asked how this could be so if the wicked did not receive Christ but merely bread and wine? [6]

Having defended the real objective presence as acceptable Anglican doctrine Forbes went on to consider, as its logical consequence, the adoration of Christ, really present, in the eucharist. "The worship is due not to the gifts, but to Christ in the gifts", he affirmed. [7] "Either Christ is present, or He is not. If He is, He ought to be adored; if He is not, *cadit quaestio*" [the question falls]. [8] He argued that the Anglican formularies only condemned worship addressed to the outward parts of the eucharistic sacrament, the bread and wine, or to a material presence of the human Jesus, but not the worship of the ascended Christ really

present. [9] But he did not think that worship of Christ sacramentally-present permitted the extravagant ritual introduced by some Anglo-Catholic priests. He maintained that while the "truly pious mind delights in magnificent ritual, finding therein the expression of many high dogmatic verities, yet we must remember that there must always be a certain proportion to be kept between the ritual and the religious life of a congregation". [10]

The next consequence of the real presence of Christ for Forbes was that the eucharist became a sacrifice. Again he defended this through patristic evidence, claiming "the ancient doctors teach that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the Cross." [11] But lest he be charged with teaching the eucharist as a repetition of Calvary, and therefore blurring the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice, he argued that the sacrifice of Christ was not limited solely to Calvary but rather was the whole offering of himself in obedience to the Father, from incarnation to ascension. He also asserted that the eucharist was not a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ but its re-presentation, made possible by the presence of the ascended and eternal Christ. [12]

Lastly he took up the contemporary debate on the Scottish Communion Office. After expressing his inability to appreciate the argument against having two liturgies in the one Church, the Eastern Orthodox living harmoniously with two, he acknowledged the "very strong prejudice" against the Scottish Communion Office from some members of the Episcopal Church. For his part he had:

> no sympathy with those few earnest men who scruple to use the English Office, nor with those who look upon the question as a national one. I use the English Office constantly myself; I believe its consecration is valid, and in validity there can be no question of degree. As it stands at present, I regard it as a sad mutilation of the first Office of the Reformers; and an Eucharistic service "more marred than any," but still, thanks be to God, preserving all the essentials of a true Sacrament. [13]

He considered there was a duty towards using the Scottish Communion Office as the embodiment of the faith of their forebears. It was necessary to uphold it despite its present unpopularity, and he pointed to the frequent scriptural references of what he called the "deadly antagonism" between unpopularity and truth. However, for Forbes the Scottish Communion Office was principally important because it represented a closer conformity with the practice of the patristic Church than did the English liturgy in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Thus, to Forbes, the Scottish Office was more faithful to the belief of the apostolic Church, the period when, according to him, the Christian revelation was perfectly and completely delivered by Christ. In this way the Scottish Office was an example of his understanding of religious truth, that historically earlier was better than later insofar as Christian truth went.

> I believe that the Scottish Office embodies the principle of Primitive Christianity; that, coming, as it does, confessedly nearer to the ancient Liturgies, it bears witness not only to the two great Christian doctrines of Eucharistic Sacrifice and Real Presence, but to the whole Vincentian theory - that Christianity is a final revelation, not a progressive philosophy; thus preserving us against all those theories which are prevalent in the present day, of a supplemental revelation, which exhibit themselves so offensively in Mormonism, less coarsely in Irvingism, and in that school of the Roman Catholic Church which not only rests on the theory of development, but which lays so much store by that additional religion drawn from the visions and experiences of the saints. [14]

Forbes was, on the one hand, opposing the theology of an historical unfolding of original revelation particularly associated in Britain with Newman's *Essay on the Development of Doctrine* (1845). On the other he challenged any claim to what he considered new or further revelation given to the Church in mystical or personal experience, such as the charismatic phenomena associated with the preaching of Edward Irving in London, or, for example, the arguments drawn by the papacy from the history of piety for the 1854 definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. His understanding of religious truth was more closed and static - all Christian truth was delivered once and for all in the event of Jesus Christ, and

only interpreted thereafter. To abolish the Scottish Communion Office would not, he felt, bring the Scottish Episcopal Church any closer sympathy from the Evangelical party in the Church of England, as some in Scotland hoped, but merely serve to alienate its High Church members and give the Scottish Church a reputation for inconstancy. "Nothing gives such weight to religion as its fixedness. Nothing is so impressive as the unchangingness of tradition." [15] Forbes believed that the Scottish Communion Office would make an important contribution to the future of Anglican Church. As the liturgy of a non-established Church it demonstrated that Anglicanism need not be erastian. This was particularly important as Forbes envisaged Anglicanism becoming increasingly significant throughout the world, as the religion of the "present imperial race", and also as a catalyst for possible Christian reunion with its "hierarchy and valid sacraments" on the one hand and "open Bible" on the other. [16]

Such was the substance of Forbes' charge, the first he had given to his diocesan synod since his consecration as bishop. His break in 1857 with the practice of his first ten years was significant. Significant also that it should have been such a weighty piece of theology on this particular topic for such a tiny gathering. (In that year the synod of the diocese of Brechin numbered just fourteen clergy). What then was Forbes' motivation for such a charge at that particular time?

Forbes' previous biographer, William Perry, considered the principal reason for the charge to have been Forbes' distress at the impoverished conception of the eucharist and the lack of reverence among Episcopalians in Dundee. [17] But the evidence in the charge shows that Forbes had a wider concern than simply the shallowness of Episcopalian piety. In the charge, Forbes referred to the

contemporary controversy on the eucharist in the Church of England concerning the prosecution of George Anthony Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton, for his eucharistic teaching of the real objective presence and eucharistic sacrifice in three sermons preached in Wells cathedral in 1854. Ostensibly a prosecution by one of the clergy of the diocese of Bath and Wells, it was in fact motivated and sustained by the Evangelical Alliance. Denison's teaching was found contrary to the 28th and 29th Articles by Archbishop Sumner's court at Bath on 12 August 1856 and Denison was sentenced to deprivation. The judgement was reversed on a technicality after appeal to the Court of Arches on 23 April 1857. An appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by the prosecution was rejected, again on a technicality, on 6 February 1858. [18] In his charge, Forbes commented on the case. He regretted that a doctrine not defined by the Church should be made a test for communion, and that something so sacred was brought before the civil courts "to a tribunal so constituted from the intermixture of laymen, as to exceed the powers given it by God, when it attempted to define a doctrine". But he thought the chief misfortune was the harm the case had done to the faith of Church members, being "a blow struck at the whole sacramental system, as an attack upon one great supernatural element in religion". [19] Forbes had been following the Denison case and had drawn the attention of his episcopal colleagues to it at the meeting of the Episcopal Synod on 25 September 1856. [20]

Forbes' charge was delivered while the Denison case was still going through its judicial process, and the case posed particular problems for Tractarians. The archbishop's was the only court to address itself to the substantive issues involved and it found against Denison's claim that his teaching was that of the Church of England. It was also uncomfortable to have the teaching of the Church brought before the civil courts. In this way the Denison case threatened two fundamental

claims of the Oxford Movement - that the Church was spiritually independent of the state; and that the Church of England was Catholic in practice and doctrine. Forbes' charge was in fact part of a general Tractarian response to the challenge of the Denison case, a response instigated by John Keble. In two letters to Forbes, written in 1859, Keble said he had "played the Trumpeter in this fight". [21] Later that same year Keble wrote that he desired to share Forbes' trouble "were it only that I was instrumental (whether mistakenly so or not) in the manner of what I did in bringing the trouble upon you". [22] Keble had encouraged the publication of three works on the eucharist explicitly designed to refute the verdict of the archbishop's court that Denison's teaching was contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. These were: Keble's *On Eucharistical Adoration* (1857); Pusey's *The Real Presence* (1857); and Forbes' charge. Pusey and Keble were acknowledged leaders in the Catholic revival, but Forbes also was an important figure to Tractarians. He was, apart from Hamilton of Salisbury, the only Tractarian bishop. From its very beginning, in Tract 1, the Oxford Movement had exalted the episcopate as an expression of the spiritual independence of the Church. Even if the bishops of the Church of England, to Newman's consternation, proved unwilling to live up to Tractarian claims, it was only to be expected that the first bishop espousing the aims of the Oxford Movement should be a prominent figure for Tractarians. Forbes was no doubt glad to be included in the defence for he considered Denison to be an unhappy choice of victim, as he did not have "a theological head". [23] All three works argued, like Denison, that the doctrine of the "real, objective presence", of Christ in the eucharist was the teaching of the Anglican Church. It had been Robert Wilberforce who had been the first among Tractarians to argue for a "real objective presence" in eucharistic theology, in his book *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (1853). [24] Before then Tractarians had been content to speak of a real, but spiritual presence, or a "virtual" presence.

Pusey, and especially Keble, were at first reluctant to see any weakness in the former virtualist language. It was the trial of Archdeacon Denison that pushed them into asking what exactly such a "virtual presence" was, and into adopting Wilberforce's language, whose theology had influenced Denison. They could not defend Denison if they did not also subscribe to the theological terms he had used in his condemned sermons, for the case against the archdeacon was precisely about such language. But if they did not defend Denison, or uphold his theology, it would have appeared to be a denial of his eucharistic teaching and an acquiescence in Erastian interference in the teaching of the Church. Denison's trial forced the original Tractarian leaders to greater definition in their eucharistic theology, adopting that of the younger generation of the movement.

As well as contributing to a defence of Denison, Forbes was also motivated in his charge by an opportunity to address the religious doubt of his time and to propose his remedy for it. The present he regarded as an age of "restlessness and uncertainty" where old truths were being "irreverently called into question". He pointed to the inspiration of scripture being increasingly questioned by what he called "a self-sufficient and fearless criticism". New divine revelation was being claimed, he said, by the rise of Mormonism among the poor and Irvingism among the upper classes. There was doubt about hell, and the people were looking for truth in the divine spirit immanent in nature and personal experience, rather than in Christian doctrine. He questioned the effects of empirical science with its concentration on the physical universe. There was also what Forbes called Nestorianism (the heresy that there are two separate persons, human and divine, in the incarnate Christ) by which he probably meant such freethinkers as Francis Newman and J.A.Froude. These had relinquished belief in Jesus as God while maintaining respect for him as an historical figure and great moral teacher.

According to Forbes it was all leading to "a vague spiritualism and religion of sensations...taking the place of the old orthodox Christianity". Forbes' remedy was to appeal to tradition because clarity of Christian revelation he believed could be found in the first centuries of the Church.

> In such a state of the human mind we must have something to rest upon, and where shall we find that save in an appeal to the universal tradition and consent of the Christian Church...To what ages shall we refer but to those in which they spoke who had drunk in knowledge from the lips of the Apostles of God, and learnt doctrine from those who had heard the "voice of Wisdom crying in their streets". [25]

From his experience in Dundee, Forbes had already grown concerned that the social conditions of the newly urbanised poor were contributing to declining church attendance and belief. [26] However on such an occasion as a diocesan synod, addressing his clergy as their bishop and teacher, Forbes concentrated on the intellectual aspects of the erosion of orthodox religious belief.

By the 1850's British Christianity was having to contend with increasing domestic challenges to orthodox belief. Some freethinkers, like Francis Newman in *Phases of Faith* (1850), had rejected the infallibility of scripture from the evidence of empirical knowledge. During the first half of the century the immanentism of the Romantic Movement had found truth in personal experience and imagination, as against transcendent revelation encapsulated in doctrinal or creedal formulae. The predominant social philosophy of utilitarianism was materialist in its conception of human nature and knowledge. Biblical inspiration was gradually coming under threat from scientific and historical knowledge. This potential conflict had begun to show itself in Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1830-33) and later, and more explicitly, in his *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man* (1863). An anonymous work, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (1844) had previously proved immensely popular in calling attention to the theory of evolution, although

it was scientifically wildly inaccurate.

> The early nineteenth century, so placid-seeming to us today, was in fact an era of far-reaching change, intellectual as well as social and industrial. Such indeed was the momentum that the accustomed cer tainties, even for those who held on to them - still the great majority - had plainly ceased to be above the tidemark of doubt. The large-scale erosion of belief had begun. [27]

Walter Houghton's examination of the literature of the Victorian middle and upper classes confirmed this period as increasingly conscious of its own religious doubt. He traced the breakdown of the old orthodox certainties, beginning in the late 1820's and early 1830's. Such things as railways producing a sense of mobility and speed, industrial development and wealth, and increasing knowledge, caused the Victorians to think of their society as one in transition. For them it was changing towards an ill-defined but better future, separated from its medieval past. But while the old certainties were passing, by the 1870's there was as yet no replacement. It was an age of doubt, although Victorians at this time never doubted their intellectual capacity to arrive, eventually, at truth, and Victorian confidence in reason made doubt a fluctuating experience for most. [28] This experience of the increasing difficulty of faith and the growing persistence of religious doubt was encapsulated most famously in Arnold's poem *Dover Beach*. Arnold saw faith nostalgically as a lost experience of the past which had receded like the ebb-tide. But the majority of Victorians did not see their doubt as a liberation but rather retained the yearning to believe.

In the latter half of the 1850's Forbes was already demonstrating a concern about some of the influences he mentioned in his charge as contributing to religious uncertainty, particularly biblical criticism and science. The remedy of exact theology he had proposed in previous books found further expression in his 1857 charge, and it owed a great deal to the Victorian concern for truth. As he said in

his charge when speaking of living in an age of uncertainty, there was the need for the mind to rest upon something secure. Forbes believed secure truth could be found in those periods of the Church's history "in which they spoke who had drunk in knowledge from the lips of the Apostles of God, and learnt doctrine from those who had heard the voice of Wisdom crying in their streets". Forbes was not addressing the doubts of those who had already rejected the divinity of Christ. His audience were members of the Church who believed in God and in God revealed in Christ, but were prey to doubts. He therefore took such belief for granted, wanting to reinforce and secure it by claiming the sufficiency of the Christ-event for salvation and truth. Therefore he argued not only that divine knowledge was definitely and certainly given by Christ, but also that such saving knowledge was complete at that time. As he claimed in his charge, "Christianity is a final revelation, not a progressive philosophy". It meant the way to God's truth was historically backwards, to the time of Christ and the apostles. The first Christian centuries were authoritative for Forbes because of their proximity to the source of revelation in the life of Christ. This combination of scripture interpreted by the early Church was what Forbes called in his charge the "paramount rule of faith" of the Anglican Church. Any ambiguities between various patristic writers could be dealt with, he believed, by appealing to what was believed in by the whole Church, as opposed to particular writers or Churches. So the history of revelation, for Forbes, was that Christ revealed completely to the apostles all that was necessary to salvation. They in turn transmitted such teaching to the Church through the scriptures and their oral instruction. The patristic Church, living in the centuries closest to the original source and the transmission of revelation, retained for the Church a vital, if secondary, explanatory function of the revelation of Christ. No further revelation was either necessary or possible after Christ. The task of the Church since, according to Forbes, was simply to explain such doctrine for

contemporary Christians, without addition or change; or to remind the Church of those parts of revealed truth it may have lost sight of. This was the basis for Forbes's charge. To remind the Church of the doctrine of the "real, objective presence" of Christ in the eucharist, and to affirm for Forbes' Christian audience the certainty of the original deposit of truth given by Christ to the Church.

According to Perry the first intimation of opposition to the charge came after Forbes' return from a summer holiday in the south of France. At the meeting of the Episcopal Synod in September 1857, Bishop Walter Trower of Glasgow denounced the charge but full discussion was postponed until the following December meeting. [29] Discussion was evidently postponed because Eden, and perhaps others, had not then read the charge. [30] By the December meeting Trower had made a formal objection in a letter to Bishop Charles Terrot of Edinburgh. This gave notice to Bishop Terrot, as primus, of Trower's intention to move "dissent from certain parts of the Bishop of Brechin's charge respecting the reverence due to the consecrated Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper and also the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice". [31]

Notice of Trower's intention was communicated to the bishops prior to the convening of the synod, so Forbes had prepared a protest against the synod having jurisdiction in a matter he regarded as lying within diocesan autonomy. After Forbes had read his protest the meeting resolved by majority that it could not be sustained. Trower however withdrew his notice of motion in favour of one by the primus. Terrot had prepared a paper on the charge and desired to have this issued under the authority of the synod. He withdrew his motion (presumably one seeking such authority), when the bishops' could not agree to it. But he reserved the right to make use of the paper he had prepared "as he deemed expedient". [32]

Charles Terrot had succeeded William Skinner of Aberdeen as primus only that year, so perhaps was constrained at the December meeting by his new role as chairman of the synod. But he openly declared himself a few days later when he, with Ewing and Trower, issued on their own authority a declaration against the charge. Although the synod minutes do not give the contents of the paper Terrot brought to the December synod it is likely, given the few days between the synod and the declaration, that in substance the latter was the paper he had prepared for the synod.

Terrot was regarded by the nineteenth century Episcopalian biographer, William Walker, as one of the ablest primus of that century, albeit restricted by physical weakness. [33] But, as primus, Terrot had a serious deficiency in that his background gave him little sympathy for the northern, nonjuring tradition of the Episcopal Church. Born in 1790, as a boy he spent his holidays with his uncle, who was minister of the qualified congregation of Haddington. Terrot graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1814 he was ordained priest by the bishop of Chester. Later that year he went back to Haddington as minister of the congregation, and the following year led them into union with the Episcopal Church. Walker commented that Terrot was "much in sympathy with the Edinburgh clergy of the time, and the moderate High Church views which they professed - views, which, with slight modification, he held and taught to the last". [34] Terrot was ordained bishop of Edinburgh in 1841, when he was the incumbent of St. Paul's, Edinburgh, the most prestigious congregation in Edinburgh at that time. Walker perfectly captures this careful, moderate High Churchman as one who looked upon himself as a "Scottish rather than an English Churchman, but it was a Scottish Churchman of the Edinburgh or trans-Forthian type - one who had no sympathy with the Scotch Office or any of the Non-juring traditions". [35] Terrot

saw the Episcopal Church as very much made in his own image, as comprised largely of moderate anglicized High Churchmen like himself. This was not surprising, given that his pastoral experience was confined to the south of Scotland. In writing to Bishop William Skinner of Aberdeen in 1844 he said:

> I may mention that the impression on my mind is that the great majority of the laity are not in heart Scotch Episcopalians, but Church of England men, and I have heard from many, most of them Edinburgh people, some from Aberdeenshire, great stress laid upon the desir ableness of perfect conformity [with the Church of England]. [36]

The declaration by these three bishops was published in the December 1857 edition of the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*. It did not mention Forbes or his charge, but instead spoke of "recent statements" on the Lord's Supper which appeared to be contradictory to the teaching of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of England and which were "injuring pious minds". The bishops declared their belief in five points, basically opposing eucharistic adoration and sacrifice. [37] The declaration was an affirmation of High Church theology sympathetic to the Reformation, by three bishops with more than one eye on the Church of England.

The High Church party in the Church of England had been formed of those Laudians who, in 1688, had been able to accept the Glorious Revolution, and later the Hanoverian Succession, and so remain within the establishment. Largely antipathetic to the Nonjurors, they saw themselves as the true successors of the seventeenth century Caroline Divines. They were the "high and dry" men who upheld a theology which emphasized the Church and the sacraments as divine institutions, with a fervent attachment to the Church of England as established by law, and a suspicion of religious enthusiasm. In the nineteenth century their leading theologian was William Palmer of Worcester College. In his *Origines Liturgicae*

(1832) he expressed a High Church eucharistic theology similar to that of the three bishops, in theological language which was indefinite, capable of either a receptionist interpretation or a stricter one. [38] It was just such vagueness which Oxford Movement men like Forbes found unsatisfactory in High Church and nonjuring doctrine.

Like all High Churchmen the three bishops were antagonistic to Rome. Unlike Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics, High Churchmen disliked and distrusted Rome as a source of superstition and religious error. They also increasingly felt the same way about the Oxford Movement, believing the movement was turning its back on the heritage of the Reformation and leading to conversions to popery. A couple of months after Newman's conversion in 1845, Terrot criticised the few in Scotland who had followed Newman's example in seceding from the Episcopal Church as expressing, "no sort of horror at their apostasy". Terrot, like High Churchmen generally, disliked religious extremism, considering the Episcopal Church was "sadly har ased in Scotland by a few men who go into the extremes of Puritanism and Puseyism, and that have a bone of contention in our Scotch Communion Office". [39] Similar concern, by the High Churchmen, about Tractarian sympathy for Roman Catholicism surfaced repeatedly throughout the controversy. They feared Forbes' teaching was reviving teaching repudiated by the Church of England at the Reformation. High Churchmen added their dislike of Puseyism to their traditional distaste for Evangelical enthusiasm and doctrine. Their ideal was a sober thoughtful religion undergirded by High Church doctrine and a love of the prayer book, and safeguarded by the principle of legal establishment. The Church of England, for High Churchmen, if not quite perfect, was certainly more so than any alternative on offer.

The same attachment to the Church of England is found in the three bishops' declaration, which spoke not only of the incompatibility of "recent statements" (a reference to Forbes charge) with the teaching of the Episcopal Church but also with that of the Church of England. It was their partiality for the example and authority of the Church of England which provided the most immediate reason for their opposition to Forbes. The Scottish bishops had long been seeking the removal of the legal disqualification of Episcopal clergy ordained by Scottish bishops to hold a living in England. This was a part of the act of 1792 which had removed the illegal status of the Scottish Episcopal Church. In response to submissions by the Episcopal Synod begun in 1837, an act of 1840 relaxed this disqualification by permitting these Scottish-ordained clergy to officiate in England, but only for up to two days. [40] In 1853 the bishops pressed for further alleviation when Forbes, William Skinner and Charles Wordsworth prepared a petition for presentation to Parliament. Forbes had for some years been opposed to the removal of the disqualification because he felt it would draw the best clergy south into the more lucrative livings of the Church of England. He changed his mind, however, when Episcopalian stipends improved. In 1857 a clerical deputation was sent to London, consisting of Terrot, Trower and Wordsworth, all men ordained in England. In a statement dated 24 July 1857 Terrot reported the failure of their efforts in London to win influential friends to their cause. They were unable even to secure a seconder for their proposal in the House of Commons. For Terrot, the lack of success had two causes - fear of the effect on the principle of establishment in assisting a non-established Church in Scotland; but principally, opposition from English Evangelicals.

> Among those who we expected wd. favour us, we find that our proposition is considered as subversive of the Establishment principle, & hostile to the supremacy of the crown. But the strongest opposition is from the Low Church - from the party represented by the Record, by Exeter Hall, & considered as headed by Lord Shaftesbury. A Society of this party called the Protestant

> Defence Society, have issued a course of papers directed against the Scotch Epl. Church; and though many of their misrepresentations are so gross as to disgust those who know us, I regret to say that they have been too successful in persuading many, that we ought not to be received into any nearer communion with the Ch. of England. [41]

Evangelicals were the most organized party in the Church of England by the middle of the nineteenth century. From their earlier experience with the anti-slavery movement, and later in support of Shaftesbury's factory acts, the Evangelicals knew how to organise politically in support of their desired ends. They were united in hostility to any closer ties between the Church of England and the small, but more uniformly high Church north of the border. When Terrot suggested a petition from Scotland supporting Episcopal relief, he was reminded by Wordsworth and Trower that they "wd. be met & overwhelmed by a much larger mass of petitions from a well-organised party hostile to us". [42]

After Terrot's report in July 1857 it must have been clear to the bishops just how formidable an obstacle the Evangelical party in the Church of England constituted. The bishops would either have to overcome that resistance or relinquish their hopes of legal alleviation. Terrot, Trower and Wordsworth were convinced by their visit to London that the Evangelical opposition could not be beaten, so the other alternative was to mollify them. This meant stressing what the Episcopal Church had in common with Evangelical views, and playing down any High Church belief which could further alienate Evangelical suspicions. It was probably in reaction to such suggestions among his episcopal brethren that Forbes, in his charge, had dismissed the idea that abolishing the Scottish Communion Office would bring about closer sympathy between the Episcopal Church and English Evangelicals.

The Scottish bishops were not Evangelicals but they looked on conformity with England as a thing to be desired and sought to remove whatever within the Episcopal Church stood in the way of such conformity. Of the seven bishops, all but Alexander Ewing had been ordained priest in England, and all but Ewing and Forbes had been born there. Ewing, however, had no sympathy for the native traditions of Scottish Episcopacy. To be sure, Ewing had been born in Aberdeen, and had spent all his clerical life in the north of Scotland. But he had also been sent to school in Chelsea where he was deeply influenced by an Evangelical schoolmaster. [43] Although he had a romantic love for the highlands and their Celtic past, he too looked south and desired conformity with the Church of England. Unlike the Scottish Episcopal tradition and the Oxford Movement, Ewing did not regard Episcopacy as being of the *esse* of the Church. Indeed, he advocated "something of the nature of a union between the Episcopal Church and the national Church of Scotland". [44]

Ewing and Terrot then had their own good reasons for issuing their declaration against Forbes' charge. In the same month of December this declaration was followed by a statement from Charles Wordsworth of St. Andrews and Bishop Robert Eden of Moray and Ross which, they claimed, was issued to avoid any "misunderstanding" at not having signed the earlier declaration. These two bishops stated they were withholding their opinion for the present because of the prospect of charges being brought against "one of their brethren", and the matter was due to be discussed at the next Episcopal Synod anyway. [45] Eden and Wordsworth evidently considered the declaration by the other bishops premature and hasty, involving them in moral and judicial dilemmas should they be called on to act as judges over Forbes' charge. At the same time they too were anxious lest silence be interpreted as approval for the charge.

Eden, at least, did not think the charge actually heretical. In a letter to Terrot on 28 October 1857, he said he did not care for some of Forbes' expressions, and particularly for the attempt in the charge further to define doctrine. But Eden did not consider that Forbes went beyond "the latitude & opinion which the Church allows". He also thought that any adoption of judicial proceedings by the bishops against Forbes would "work injury in our own Church, & in the Church of England". [46]

Greater approval for the three bishops' declaration was more forthcoming in other quarters. Dean Ramsay and nineteen of the clergy of Edinburgh diocese sent an address to their bishop, Terrot, giving their "respectful and grateful acknowledgement of the Declaration", and had it published in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* in January 1858. [47] No doubt many of these clergy were also troubled by the thought of an important distinction between themselves and the Church of England. It has already been observed how anglicised the southern clergy had become by this time. By 1860, of fifty eight clergy in the two southernmost dioceses, thirty nine had been ordained in England. [48]

Opposition to Forbes' charge was gathering force and organisation. Following a meeting in Edinburgh on 23 January 1858 a memorial opposing the charge, signed by one hundred and three laymen headed by the Earl of Wemyss, was presented to the three bishops. In this memorial Forbes was mentioned by name for the first time in the controversy. The memorialists spoke strongly of "pain and alarm that the Bishop of Brechin...has promulgated doctrines repugnant to our convictions, and inconsistent with what we have hitherto believed to be the tenets and the teaching of the Church". If Forbes' doctrines could claim his episcopal authority, they feared there would no longer be adequate security for "the teaching

of the Protestant Faith which we profess". [49] Like the southern clergy, many leading Episcopalian laity, especially among the upper classes, valued links with England, and desired conformity with the Church of England. They accepted their Church was a Protestant body, and feared for its unity if Tractarian teaching like Forbes' were to prevail. One such lay opponent was Sir John Ogilvie, of Forbes' own congregation. He wrote to Forbes in February 1860, reminding Forbes that he had disapproved of the charge when it was first delivered, and had signed a protest against it. Ogilvie, a member of Parliament and a Scottish landowner, admired Forbes' pastoral work among the poor of Dundee and disliked the manner and spirit of the bishop's opponents, but he could not support Forbes' teaching on the eucharist. [50] He wanted to see the controversy over with as soon as possible so that Forbes and the Church could get back to the more important business of ameliorating the lot of the poor.

Forbes replied to Lord Wemyss in a public letter on 6 February 1858, respectfully questioning the theological competency of the laity to judge "such abstruse subjects as are in the charge". Further, he pressed for a canonical trial instead of such "agitation" and, in conclusion, claimed his teaching was within the usual doctrinal toleration of the Anglican Church.

> If my doctrine is not the doctrine of the Church of Christ from the beginning, if it exceeds the wise latitude which the Anglican Church has ever allowed her children, I am quite prepared to take the consequences. I have the deepest conviction that what I have taught is the Truth of God, and therefore, I feel sure that eventually that truth will vindicate and assert its supremacy, even though at the cost of my personal comfort. [51]

So attitudes were hardening. The south, influenced by its proximity to England, and by English High Churchmanship, was increasingly against Forbes. Even Keble, always disliking controversy, expressed doubts to Forbes about the wisdom of

the project he had initiated against Denison's condemnation. [52] Forbes on the other hand was actively pursuing that programme. By courting the possibility of a trial, he was following Keble's suggestion that those who agreed with Denison could likewise publish the same teaching and be liable to the same "molestations and penalities". [53] Forbes informed Gladstone in February 1858 of the "terrible mess we have got ourselves into as a result of my charge" and told him that the declaration of the three bishops was being sent to congregations, "like a fiery cross". He was now, he said, waiting for a further move against him. The bishops were being led by Bishop Trower who was "quite fanatical against me - the others are timid & very sorry for themselves. Hints at disruption & extensive Drummondizing have terrified them". [54] Forbes was referring here to the followers of the Revd. D.T.K. Drummond, an English priest, who had separated themselves from the Episcopal Church over their opposition to the Scottish Communion Office.

Forbes, though, did not wait for further opposition moves. On 16 January 1858 he told his nephew-in-law George Boyle, (his "Son in Xt", later the sixth Earl of Glasgow), that the second edition of his charge was being printed and that in it he had "pretty well disposed of the Three Bishops' paper". At this stage Forbes was feeling confident, even overconfident given that the public opposition already included most of the leading figures in the Episcopal Church. He could, he told Boyle, bear with "equanimity (if not without heartache) the anxieties of these times". Remarking on the interest in the newspapers, he commented wryly, "Surely it is proof that the Presbyterians feel the hidden reality of our Church & the searching values of Catholic truth, that the charge of a single Bishop should set all Scotland in a commotion". [55] Forbes seemed to be preparing himself to become a northern Denison and a Tractarian witness to dogmatic truth.

Up to this point Pusey had not read Forbes' charge, but the possibility of judicial proceedings now made him do so. Pusey intervened in an attempt to mollify Trower, in the faint hope of their previous acquaintance in Oxford giving him some influence with the bishop. [56] Trower, who had been elected Bishop of Glasgow in 1848, was the first Englishman to be appointed a bishop in the Episcopal Church who had not previously worked in Scotland. Forbes doubted Pusey would change Trower's mind, for Trower seemed "almost mad upon the subject of the charge", and he felt it had been Trower's threat of resignation that had brought about the declaration of the three bishops. Forbes suspected that Trower's attitude reflected deep personal feeling, for he was "a lapsed high churchman, and they are always the most rabid opponents". [57] On 26 February Trower wrote a long letter in reply to Pusey which forcefully set out his position, defending the declaration of the three bishops as a personal statement of faith and not a formal theological definition. He thought that a formal trial was now almost inevitable and that if the result of that trial was to permit a diversity of teaching on eucharistic adoration, he would resign. Forbes, Trower believed, should have known better than to teach his doctrine "*ex cathedra*", given that Forbes' knowledge of Trower's beliefs should have made him aware Trower was likely to object strongly to the teaching of the charge. Trower then blamed Pusey's teaching for destroying his own hopes for a theological consensus among "moderate men on both sides". Pusey could not therefore complain, he wrote, about this "Theological re-action which has now set in", Trower said he did not believe in winking "at such approximations to Romish practices and doctrine as you and the Bp. of B. put out, but to oppose them firmly at whatever cost to personal comfort". Explaining that he desired a judgement by the Episcopal Synod against Forbes' teaching, Trower maintained he had, the "strongest and gravest disapproval of your cause since the very early days of the Oxford Movement". [58]

Trower, like many of Forbes' opponents, believed Forbes was claiming an "*ex cathedra*" status for his teaching. But nowhere in his original charge did Forbes explicitly claim that the doctrines he expounded were the sole authorised teaching of the Anglican Church. In fact, he specifically acknowledged that the Church of England had not defined any doctrine on eucharistic presence. [59] But some of Forbes' expressions could certainly lend themselves to Trower's interpretation. Forbes claimed to say only "what she [the Church] says". [60] He also asserted that "Holy Church...has with one voice [throughout history] declared...that the bread of the Eucharist is the Flesh of the Incarnate Jesus". [61] He held that "the true faith of Anglicanism" was based on "authoritative documents", and that these proved his teaching. Forbes was convinced that the doctrines he taught were Catholic truth, and that Anglican theological authorities were favourable to such an interpretation. He did however recognise that these "authoritative documents" could be, and were, differently interpreted, and that differing interpretations were not excluded by the Church. No doubt Forbes viewed this as a blurring of Catholic truth, but he accepted it as a fact of Anglican history. In his original charge, however, he was not sufficiently clear about this, and some of his expressions, combined with the fact he was speaking as a bishop to his clergy, gave opponents the impression he taught these doctrines as definitive. In this impression they were probably correct insofar as Forbes' inmost understanding went, even perhaps his intention in the charge. But they were incorrect regarding his public statements, and by February 1858 Forbes was already following Keble's advice to claim only toleration for his teaching.

But Trower also admitted that he was motivated by a long-standing dislike of the Oxford Movement which stretched back to the days when he was a tutor at Oriel College. Forbes could have been right about Trower's sense of personal

grievance as Trower may have found life difficult at Oxford during the years of Tractarian ascendency. Whatever the personal bias, however, Trower clearly objected most of all to the Roman Catholic tendencies he saw in the Oxford Movement. He was stirred into action by Forbes' charge because it seemed to give Oxford Movement teaching an episcopal imprimatur, and he was anxious to secure an authoritative denial of Forbes' teaching, lest its influence grow within the Episcopal Church.

To what extent was Trower right in blaming Forbes for the ensuing controversy? Trower argued that the cause of the controversy was Forbes setting forth his teaching in a diocesan charge. Forbes, on the other hand, pointed to Trower's opposition as the instigation of opposition, which until then had been silent. Forbes certainly provided the issue for the controversy by choosing to address his synod on the theology of the eucharist. It was also Forbes' choice to propound Tractarian teaching on the eucharist, which he must have known would have been contentious, given the Denison precedent and his knowledge of the views of the Scottish bishops. Forbes also extended the audience for his charge by having it published. Although it may have been true for Forbes to say that there was no opposition to his teaching until Trower's formal complaint to the Episcopal Synod, the degree of support for the three bishops' declaration demonstrates the existence of widespread dissension to Forbes' teaching. Forbes must therefore bear the responsiblity for the formal cause of the resulting controversy. However, until the declaration of the three bishops, the controversy was carried out entirely within the confines of the Episcopal Synod. It was the publication of the declaration, and the letter of Wordsworth and Eden, which turned the disagreement among the bishops into a public one. Forbes had already published his charge twice, but that was a theological document of some fifty pages likely to appeal to a restricted audience.

The declaration on the other hand was a short and direct appeal to public sentiment, published in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, the Episcopalian newspaper. It was this declaration which instigated the memorials by the Edinburgh clergy and Lord Wemyss and the laity. Led by Trower's fervent opposition, and their anxiety about offending the Church of England, the five bishops took their theological differences into the public arena.

Forbes was finding himself somewhat isolated. Not only was opposition hardening among the bishops, and the southern clergy and laity, but also among the northern clergy, who were not entirely happy with his teaching. Suspicions of Roman Catholic tendencies in Forbes' teaching accounted for the opposition from some not raised in the English High Church tradition. John Alexander, for example, was one of the Edinburgh clergy who had signed the memorial to Bishop Terrot, supporting the declaration of the three bishops. Alexander was an authentic representative of the northern tradition working in the south, where he was priest at the newly built St. Columba's in Edinburgh. He had been educated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, like so many of his Episcopal counterparts during the nonjuring days. On his mother's side he was descended from a Jacobite executed after the battle of Culloden. [62] Alexander, in a letter written on 24 February 1858, said he understood the bishops to be claiming Christ was present in the consecrated elements in "virtue and efficacy: but He is not present in the very substance of His flesh and blood, so that they can be worshipped there. Their proposition presents no difficulty to me". [63] This was the same virtualism in eucharistic doctrine that Forbes and the Oxford Movement regarded as inadequately specific. In keeping with that northern tradition Alexander was strongly anti-Roman Catholic. He wanted to spread the influence and use of the Scottish Communion Office in the south and was therefore anxious to distance himself and the Office from any

apparent Roman tendencies which would be prejudicial to that aim. Alexander's fear that the doctrine Forbes was teaching would lead to secessions to Rome was evident later in the same letter when he wrote that the "new views" may claim to be "the true Catholic doctrine", but those who held them "have been slowly leaving the Church". William Bright, theological tutor at Trinity College, Glenalmond, reported that the Aberdeenshire clergy generally did not look favourably on any doctrine which departed from the expressions used by Bishop Jolly in his books on the eucharist earlier in the century. [64] The northern clergy, unlike the Tractarians, did not feel the theological language of virtualism was in any sense inadequate and were therefore content to use it. It was understood in the north that Forbes was not upholding this traditional virtualist language in his charge, and that left him with few supporters among Episcopal clergy. The eventual presenters of both Forbes and Patrick Cheyne for trial over their eucharistic doctrine were men who had been ordained and worked solely in the north. Both held the theology of virtualism. But the northern background of both men was moderated by their dislike for the Scottish Communion Office as being a sign of nonconformity with the Church of England.

Forbes' most fervent supporters were those who wrote for The *Union Newspaper*. The *Union* was the organ of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, which was dedicated to the corporate reunion of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, and its support could only increase suspicions of Forbes' Roman sympathies. Included among these supporters were the clergy of St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth. Provost Fortescue and Henry Humble were ardent English Anglo-Catholics who had declined to moderate their ways at the request of Wordsworth, their bishop. As a Tractarian foundation, the St. Ninian's clergy were among the few in Scotland to belong to the younger, ritualist,

generation of the Catholic revival, generally known as Anglo-Catholics.

Support was also forthcoming from Forbes' diocesan clergy. Although during the 1850 prayer book dispute a number of the Brechin clergy had opposed Forbes, they had almost entirely been won over by this time. Partly this was a consequence of changing personnel since 1850. Others, like Robert Thom of Drumlithie, were personally sympathetic towards the Tractarians. But many had become loyal to Forbes personally, through admiration for his pastoral energies and through his personal charm. In March 1858 the Brechin clergy published an address of sympathy and support for Forbes, stating their "entire confidence" in his teaching. It was signed by fourteen clergy. William Henderson of Arbroath published a separate declaration stating that he disavowed the eucharistic doctrines within Forbes' charge. Forbes also published a reply to his clergy, expressing his gratification that his diocese remained undisturbed, and that the only opposition was from those who knew him least. [65]

An extraordinary meeting of the Episcopal Synod was called in May 1858. The first items of business were the withdrawal by Terrot and Trower of their respective motions given at the last synod and the moving of a Pastoral Letter. The Pastoral was addressed "to all faithful members of the Church in Scotland", and was caused, the bishops claimed, by the degree of opposition to the charge and particularly by the republication of Forbes' charge in a second edition. This second edition had been prompted by Forbes' need to refute the declaration of the three bishops. At this time in the controversy there was little preparedness for compromise by any party in their search for self-justification. For the first time the bishops referred to Forbes and his charge by name. At the heart of their objection was the bishops' belief that Forbes had adopted a line of theological argument

which exceeded the truth of scripture. Specifically, the bishops considered Forbes' teaching would lead inevitably to "corruptions and superstitions", that is, to Roman teaching and eucharistic devotions. The bishops called upon the clergy to teach the essential mystery of Christ's eucharistic presence, and affirmed: the Episcopal Church had no requirement for its faithful to believe this presence was a substantial one; that the eucharistic sacrifice was one of praise and thanksgiving, the sacrifice of the cross being all-sufficient for salvation; while the consecrated elements of the eucharist were to be treated with veneration, these gestures of reverence did not imply the corporal presence of Christ. [66] Forbes protested the competency of the synod to issue such a letter because he believed the canons of the Church gave responsibility for the declaration of doctrine only to the General Synod. [67] The primus ruled that the Pastoral Letter was not a judicial act and was not therefore bound by canon, but that the bishops were required by the canons to prevent erroneous doctrines. The motion for the Pastoral passed with all the bishops but Forbes voting in its favour.

The bishops then considered various memorials that had been sent to the synod. The first was from fifty clergy of all seven dioceses. These regretted the issuing of what they called "quasi definitions of faith by individual prelates" when there was a canonical procedure of discipline that could be used. The clergy asked the bishops to discourage "all unauthoritative definitions of faith" and to refrain in future from "putting-forth extra-judicial opinions or rules of Discipline tending to curtail the liberty the Church has allowed". To this attempt to restrain them, the bishops replied that it was not open to the clergy to petition the Episcopal Synod directly, but only through their various diocesan synods. The bishops also received a memorial signed by nearly six hundred laymen, who protested the charge as teaching doctrines inconsistent with the Protestant faith. Similar memorials were also

received from three parishes, including some laity of St. Andrew's, Brechin, where John Moir, the Dean of Brechin, was incumbent. [68] The bishops merely acknowledged their receipt, and referred those who signed them to the Pastoral Letter. The synod concluded by agreeing unanimously to communicate the Pastoral to each of the diocesan synods. [69]

As far as Forbes was concerned the letter was a "fearful document", and he did not see how his position and that of his supporters in his diocese could remain tenable. But he promised Pusey that he would hold on as long as he could. [70] He could derive some comfort from the support of English friends, who were now becoming increasingly interested in these Scottish developments. Richard Benson, at a meeting of the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity on 2 June 1858, proposed a motion of encouragement. [71] More publicly, there was Keble's *Considerations suggested by a late Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the most Holy Eucharist*, written to show the Pastoral Letter did not possess synodical authority. Forbes also informed his brother George on 17 June that he had a long talk with Gladstone "who is heartily with us". [72]

At this time George Forbes was beginning to be extensively consulted about the controversy by Bishop Wordsworth. Wordsworth wrote on 31 July to say he had read, and been encouraged by, George Forbes' theological opposition to his brother's teaching, which George had published as an appendix in his own privately printed periodical, the *Gospel Messenger*.* Despite having contracted polio as a

---

* These appendices were later collected and published by Forbes in a concurrent publication known as *The Panoply*. [See n.75.] The appendix Bishop Wordsworth was referring to in his letter to George Forbes (dated 31 July 1858) must have been that originally published in The *Gospel Messenger* between 20 June and 25 September 1858, later republished in The *Panoply* as "Eucharistical Adoration".

child which left him permanently crippled, George Forbes was ordained in 1848 and given charge of the small mission at Burntisland. His physical handicap did not prevent him becoming an erudite liturgical scholar, whose work has been ranked alongside Mabillon's. [73] Devoted all his life to the native Episcopal tradition represented by the Scottish Communion Office, George Forbes was the most learned representative of the northern, old nonjuring tradition. [74] His article was ostensibly written to refute Keble's *Considerations*, but there is little doubt that George had his brother's charge clearly in mind. As opposed to those he called "Adorationists", George Forbes did not think eucharistic adoration a doctrine of the early Church. Its appearance in the Anglican Church he attributed to the devotional poverty of the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1552. This resulted, he said, in devout Anglicans seeking "new and unauthorized" rituals to satisfy their feelings about the eucharist. [75] According to George Forbes the Oxford Movement doctrines of his brother were an understandable, but wrong and unauthorised departure from the teaching of the early Church, and hence of the Episcopal Church as well. He blamed their appearance on the lack of use of the Scottish Communion Office, and on the comparative devotional deficiency of the English liturgy.

The appearance of this article presented Bishop Wordsworth with a fortuitous weapon. Not only was it written by a capable scholar and leading representative of the northern tradition, but also by Alexander's brother. At the end of July Wordsworth wrote to George Forbes, complimenting him on his article which he thought would give Keble, "or any of that School, much ado to answer it satisfactorily". He explained that he was himself preparing some "Notes" on the

controversy for private circulation and for his clergy.* He would, he said, be making use of one or two references from Forbes' article. [76] The correspondence continued for the rest of 1858, with George assisting Wordsworth with his *Notes*, and also with his *Opinion* published later that year.** [77] The assistance given by George to the man who was rapidly succeeding Trower as Alexander's leading opponent among the bishops incensed their sister Helen. Not only was she mortified at the open knowledge of their division among people she met, she also considered George was being unfaithful to the brother to whom he owed his ordination.

> He [Alexander] alone induced my Father to consent...when my Father objected to his ordination George feigned a sort of madness - Dr Smith was in attendance. He said it was not real madness but a disappointment!! Since that time a great soreness has remained & extreme jealousy of Alexander, of the great influence he has over us in these matters, whereas George has none. [78]

Helen asked George to say nothing of their differences to Alexander "for he has charged me never to make a *row* wh. you for it, tho' he has been so hurt by it. He is the most exalted Christian I ever even imagined." [79] Helen was evidently very much under the influence of her older brother. Yet her mention of this story to an old family friend supports its veracity, which suggests that George had ambivalent feelings towards his brother. To a man determined to succeed despite his serious disability, George may have found it galling to know he owed his sought-after ordination to the brother who was more successful in their common profession. Even in scholarship, where George was more brilliant, Alexander produced more, being less hampered by George's near-obsession to consider everything available before publication. George's ambivalence must have been

---

* *Notes to assist towards forming a Right Judgement on the Eucharistic Controversy*, (1858).
** *Opinion of the Bishop of St. Andrews on the Appeal of the Rev. P. Cheyne*, (1858).

increased by Alexander's evident care for his brother, and his deference towards George in the correspondence they shared on matters of scholarly collaboration, such as the editing of the Arbuthnott Missal. It may be that the eucharistic controversy gave George an opportunity to oppose his brother publicly on a matter of principle, without incurring too much odium, except among his family to whom Alexander was a favourite and a leader. But George was also led to assist Wordsworth by the bishop's apparent support for the Scottish Communion Office. Writing to George in November, Wordsworth must have encouraged him when he said, "People, I find, are beginning to discover the value of the S. Office". [80] Expressing such sentiments, Wordworth could have given George Forbes the impression he had found another supporter of the Scottish Office among the bishops, a supporter without the dubious Tractarian doctrines of his brother.

The Brechin Diocesan Synod met on the 4 August 1858. In his charge to the synod that year Forbes referred to the earlier address from his clergy, and also read the dissenting declaration by Henderson. He tabled the bishops' Pastoral, and then addressed a lengthy word of "fatherly admonition" on the conduct of the controversy to date. He deplored "the acrimony and excitement" by which the controversy was carried on. Included in such deplorable things for Forbes was the involvement of "men of the world [laymen] unlearned in the nice distinctions of Theological study". But he was especially perturbed by ranco rous divisions among the clergy. He drew a characteristic Tractarian connection when he said that divine truth would only prevail according to the "earnestness and holiness of its propagators". With regard to those who differed from himself and his supporters, Forbes warned his clergy not to rest content in self-righteous or specious divisions, but to search for common ground. He made another claim for toleration of his teaching. "On the profound mystery, such as is the Holy Eucharist, there must be

an infinite variety of ways in which the Truth presents itself to our acceptance, and therefore we must ever try...to make the best of the imperfect belief of those we have to do with." [81] According to the bishop's wishes there was no discussion on his address, and the synod concluded the same day after conducting the usual matters of business including purchases for the Diocesan Library and government inspection of the schoolmistresses' Training School.

For the rest of 1858 Forbes' charge took a back seat in the increasing controversy, as his own case became entwined with the fortunes of two like-minded clergy; Patrick Cheyne, priest of St. Andrew's, Aberdeen, and William Bright, theological tutor at Trinity College, Glenalmond, both of whom held the same eucharistic theology as Forbes. During the latter part of 1858 they ran foul of the Scottish bishops for their teaching. Cheyne was the first to incur formal censure. He had given a series of sermons on the eucharist during Lent of 1857, emphasizing the real presence. He had published them early in 1858, although Forbes had counselled him against it. [82] Cheyne had been one of the candidates nominated for Bishop of Aberdeen in 1857. He was then sixty three and had spent all his life in the north. But the Aberdeen synod elected Thomas Suther, who had been ordained in the Episcopal Church and until 1855 had worked in Edinburgh and Leith. Cheyne was presented to Bishop Suther because of the eucharistic teaching of his sermons, and tried by the bishop before the diocesan synod in June 1858. In a trial described by its historian as biased and partisan, with the bishop determined to understand Cheyne's teaching to be as similar to Roman Catholic doctrine as possible, Cheyne was found guilty of false teaching. The sentence was delayed until after his appeal to the Episcopal Synod. [83] On the 21 July, the bishops dismissed the appeal on the grounds that Bishop Suther had acted within his prerogative, despite the protests of a number of Aberdeen clergy and some laity

over the fairness of the trial proceedings. Forbes was the only bishop to uphold the appeal, opining that Cheyne was not guilty of subverting the teaching of the Episcopal Church by teaching Roman Catholic doctrine. Forbes did think Cheyne had deliberately set out to be controversial, but considered that if Suther's judgement were upheld it would result in the exclusion of Episcopalians who agreed with Cheyne's theology. [84] After his appeal had been dismissed, Cheyne was sentenced by Suther to suspension from his functions as a priest until such time as he renounced the teaching of his sermons. Cheyne again appealed to the Episcopal Synod and this was heard on 30 September, after which the synod adjourned to 4 November to deliver its judgement. [85]

Concurrently with this judgement against Cheyne for his eucharistic teaching William Bright, a close associate of Forbes, was dismissed from his post as theological tutor in Trinity College, Glenalmond, in August 1858, for some remarks also in favour of the real presence. According to Forbes the attack on Bright had followed a "friendly" letter to Bright from Bishop Trower, who had referred to Keble's book on eucharistic adoration. Bright in reply had expressed his agreement with Keble. Trower then told Bright he would be urging his removal. [86] Forbes believed that Dr. Hannah, the warden of Trinity College, under pressure from the bishops, had dismissed Bright because Bright had "violated that neutrality in Church matters which a Theological Tutor shd. maintain". But Forbes was certain that the real cause of the sacking was Bright's sympathy with his charge. [87]

After the Episcopal Synod hearing Cheyne's appeal, a formal presentment for trial was made against Forbes. William Henderson and two of his vestrymen lodged their presentment on 3 October 1858 with Bishop Wilson as clerk of the synod. The presentment charged Forbes with teaching doctrines contrary to the Thirty Nine

Articles, the *Book of Common Prayer*, and the Scottish Communion Office. Specifically, the presenters alleged three unsanctioned doctrines. First, Forbes undermined Article 31 on the all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice by teaching the substantial unity of the cross and the eucharistic sacrifice. Second, contrary to Article 38 Forbes called for adoration of Christ in the eucharist. Thirdly, Forbes contradicted Article 29 by teaching that those without a living faith who receive holy communion do receive Christ. [88]

Proceedings on this presentment however had to wait until the matter of Cheyne's appeal was completed. The Episcopal Synod reconvened in Edinburgh on 4 November to deliver its verdict. Cheyne's teaching was again adjudged erroneous, and subversive of the doctrines of the Church. Cheyne was given a further opportunity to retract, until the court met again on 2 December. Forbes protested against the judgement and any proceedings which would flow from it, and asked that his protest be recorded in the minutes. [89]

The judgement of the bishops prompted a reaction among some of the clergy. A number of these apparently consulted Forbes, because early in November he was asking Pusey's advice about a stategy meeting the clergy were planning. [90] The meeting was held at Stonehaven, probably at the instigation of its incumbent, John Comper. The Dean of Brechin, John Moir, who was present, reported to Forbes that twenty four had attended the meeting on 18 November, and a declaration of belief, rather than a protest, was decided upon. [91] Daniel Sandford, a priest of St. John's, Edinburgh, also wrote to Forbes about the Stonehaven meeting. Sandford thought the result of any protest by the clergy would be their dismissal or resignation. He asked if Forbes were prepared to "act on the offensive & take us under your Episcopal protection & assume Scotland as your

diocese until you can see your way to provide us with Bishops?" [92] His question to Forbes suggests that some clergy were considering a schism, and were looking to Forbes to lead it. Forbes himself thought the Stonehaven meeting had acted "moderately & wisely under the present crisis - without committing themselves to a statement of doctrine". But in any case nothing was to be done by the clergy until after the bishops had reconvened the court on Cheyne's appeal in December. [93]

The reconvened Episcopal Synod on 2 December 1858 dismissed Cheyne's appeal in its entirety, and Forbes reiterated his protest. The sentence against Cheyne, passed previously by Bishop Suther, now came into effect and he was suspended until he retracted his published *Six Sermons*. [94] Forbes became depressed about the result and the apparent victory of Wordsworth's theological position. [95] Forbes, Pusey and Keble were agreed that Wordsworth had now overtaken Trower as the leader of the opposing bishops, and was the predominant theological influence among them. [96]

Forbes attempted to also resolve Bright's position by offering him a license in Brechin diocese. Bright was touched by the offer, but felt he could not accept as he was not resident. Instead he asked if he might be made one of Forbes' chaplains as he had decided to accept the offer from George Boyle of unofficial residence at the cathedral and college at Cumbrae (another Tractarian establishment which Boyle financed). [97] Forbes also thought of offering Cheyne a licence to officiate in Brechin diocese, but Pusey thought it would be "most provoking" to the bishops, and his chancellor and cousin, Alexander Forbes Irvine, also advised against it. [98]

During the Episcopal Synod on 2 December Forbes had evidently approached Wordsworth about the eucharistic controversy. Wordsworth, in a letter to Forbes on 21 December 1858, referred to his inability "to take any step in the direction which you mentioned when you were in Edinburgh". What these steps were, and whether they referred to Cheyne's case or to his own presentment, it is impossible now to discern as Forbes' letter initiating them no longer seems to exist. But from Forbes' description of his letter as "eirenic" it would appear it was the beginning of an attempt to find some sort of theological compromise. However, on 21 December Wordsworth returned Forbes' letter unopened because he had been stung by a letter in the *Guardian* from Pusey critical of himself. [99]

At the beginning of 1859 Keble reported to Pusey that Forbes' standing with his clergy and in Dundee itself was "very good", but less so with some of the laity in outlying parishes of the diocese. [100] Keble probably had in mind Arbroath where William Henderson was incumbent, and also the vestry of Brechin, among whom John Moir was experiencing something like a revolt against his support for his bishop. Forbes himself was still concerned for Patrick Cheyne, telling Boyle he would give £50 to Cheyne's defence fund. But he was more confident about his own position, adding in a second letter that it was "so good, I shd not like to spoil it" [by publishing his letter to Wordsworth], "At the same time it will do damage to the enemy". [101] Boyle encouraged publication so as to make it known Forbes desired peace. [102] Henry Humble, canon of St. Ninian's cathedral, Perth, and a writer for the *Union Newspaper*, also encouraged publication because he characteristically saw things in militant terms. Humble wrote, "we are at war, when all arrangements applicable to a state of peace are at an end". [103] A bitingly polite exchange of letters followed between the principal protagonists. Wordsworth sent Forbes a copy of his *Notes* and their Supplement, the writing of which he

called a "distasteful" task, undertaken reluctantly at the request of others. Wordsworth considered he had said nothing invidious, although he did not expect it to appear that way to Forbes. [104] Forbes, in reply, hoped that Wordsworth would publish as it would give him a chance to answer them. Forbes responded with the caustic politeness he sometimes used to criticise others, and said he was "glad" of the opportunity presented by their correspondence to let Wordsworth know he had informed Keble and others that his letter had been returned unopened. [105]

Wordworth's *Notes* were the most succinct expression of his position in all his pamphlets on the controversy, so it is worthwhile examining it as a presentation of his case against Forbes. The pamphlet was first printed in September 1858 for the use of his clergy. Wordsworth had it reprinted in January 1859, to include a Supplement written as a rebuttal to extra theological authorities offered in Keble's *Considerations*, and by Cheyne in his appeal. The need for a second printing makes it questionable whether its circulation was as restricted as Wordsworth claimed. As well as seeking to refute Forbes and Keble, Wordsworth was primarily concerned to uphold the authority of the bishops' Pastoral Letter, which he described by the authoritative title of a "Synodal Letter". Most of the pamphlet was concerned to demonstrate that, according to Wordsworth, the patristic and Anglican divines Forbes and Keble used did not support their theological claims for the eucharist. But it was in the last two chapters that Wordsworth set out his own arguments and where his language was strongest. He accused Forbes of disloyalty and denigration towards the theologians of the Episcopal past, such as the Nonjurors, and of encouraging insubordination and promoting "a conspiracy against Episcopal and Synodical authority". [106] In the final chapter Wordsworth defended the Pastoral Letter against the accusation of having narrowed the terms of communion in the Episcopal Church. He claimed the fundamental question at the

basis of the controversy was:

> Has the Church the power simply to censure a Publication which it considers *offensive* and *dangerous*? And if so, who are the Parties to exercise this power, according to the existing constitution of our own Church? [107]

Wordsworth answered his own question by saying that censorship was necessary, because some disputed questions could only be settled by authority. He then claimed it was the bishops to whom the existing constitution gave "the chief ordinary powers of administration and jurisdiction". Forbes, he said, was guilty of insubordination in conspiring against this constitutional authority. The Pastoral Letter therefore, was not merely the "letter of six bishops" as Forbes' supporters claimed, but a "GODLY ADMONITION" of synodical authority. Wordsworth claimed the Pastoral was also issued to restate the "anti-Roman position" of the Episcopal Church against the likes of Forbes' charge. Otherwise the charge would lead the Church back to the corruption and superstition from which the Reformation had delivered it. Wordsworth asserted finally that it was not the six bishops, but Forbes and Keble, who were narrowing the terms of communion. According to Wordsworth, it was they who were seeking to make their teaching mandatory, and the Pastoral Letter which offered resistance to this demand. [108]

Who was right? As to the correct exegesis of patristic and Anglican theologians, both Forbes and Wordsworth used these writings simply as proof texts, without regard to the historic context in which the various theologians were writing. Therefore they both tended to read into them the theological arguments they themselves wanted to uphold. But the crux of Wordsworth's accusations was that Forbes, in not accepting the censure of the Pastoral Letter, was guilty of denying the properly constituted authority of the Episcopal Church that he, as a bishop, was sworn to uphold. So the question hinged on the exact authority of the Pastoral. Was it simply the considered opinion of the majority of the bishops, or had it the

synodical authority Wordsworth claimed? Wordsworth alleged the existing constitution of the Church gave the bishops the authority to issue the Pastoral. This constitution could only be the legislation enacted in the canons, and those in effect at the time had been passed by the General Synod of 1838. Forbes argued that in pronouncing on a matter of doctrine the Episcopal Synod exceeded its authority and trespassed on the preserve of General Synod. Canon xxxviii of the 1838 Canons, described a pastoral letter as "containing an account of all the circumstances and occurrences, adverse as well as prosperous, which they [the bishops] think it may be for the benefit of the Church to be generally known". It said nothing about doctrine. The canons did describe the Episcopal Synod as the final court of appeal in matters of ecclesiastical dispute (Canon xxxv), which obviously could include disputes about doctrine. But the May synod, which issued the Pastoral, had no such appeal before it to give the bishops jurisdiction. In fact the canons made no mention of doctrine, the defining or explanation of it, whatsoever. The only business of an Episcopal Synod mentioned by the canons was the receiving of appeals (Canon xxxiv). The Introduction to the canons did mention doctrine as "fixed and immutable" because founded on scripture, but it did not say who or what defined it. There was therefore no canonical, that is, no constitutional, authority for the bishops to issue a pastoral letter pronouncing on doctrine; indeed no constitutional authority for them to make any binding judgement on doctrine at all, save by way of acting as a court of appeal, or in the trial of a bishop. On the basis of the constitutional authority Wordsworth appealed to, Forbes was not compelled to accept the bishops' Pastoral Letter, even if it was issued by the majority at an Episcopal Synod. The only document that did seem to bear upon any requirement of Forbes to accept the Pastoral as a binding authority was the eighteenth-century concordat he had signed on his consecration as a bishop. According to this, all bishops promised "that in all matters relating to the Church, Worship and Discipline" they

would be "determined" [that is, limit themselves] by a majority of the bench. But this concordat was not mentioned by Wordsworth, who instead insisted on the "synodal authority" of the Episcopal Synod as exercising "the chief ordinary powers of administration and jurisdiction". But these powers did not include the definition of doctrine. Indeed that power was not explicitly given to any body by the constitution, unless the General Synod elected to do so by framing a canon. Authority over doctrine, except by way of judicial appeal to the Episcopal Synod, was constitutionally in a vacuum, a vacuum the Episcopal Synod was trying to fill, being the oldest, continuing, authoritative body in the Episcopal Church. Those doctrinal disputes which had arisen in the past, such as the authority of bishops and of the Scottish Communion Office, had been jurisdictional. The eucharistic controversy was a more purely doctrinal dispute, and much of the confusion in the controversy arose because, until Forbes was legally presented for trial, it remained uncertain just who had authority to pronounce on doctrinal matters and could require the obedience of the disputants. Such confusion was only made worse when the one group claiming such authority, the bishops in synod, were also parties to the controversy through their various publications.

A followup to the Stonehaven meeting took place among the clergy on 20 January 1859 at Laurencekirk. The clergy were to consider an amended version of the Stonehaven declaration. Forbes, who as usual had been consulted beforehand, encouraged his nephew George Boyle to attend. He could act, Forbes believed, as a check on "the more violent ones" and support the counsels of moderation, such as that of Dean Moir. On the other hand, Forbes thought Boyle's presence would encourage the lukewarm to attend. [109] He defended his part in the clergy's meeting by claiming something had to be done to make it known that acquiescence with the Cheyne judgement would harm the terms of communion. However, he said

he was in no way responsible for the decisions of the meeting, and placed the responsibility for the agitation by the clergy on the bishops. "The real reason for the abnormal form of action is the...tyranny that is being exercised by the dominant majority in the Church." [110]

Both Boyle and Dean Moir reported back to Forbes after the Laurencekirk meeting. Boyle sent Forbes an extract of the minutes of the meeting, which had passed three resolutions. Essentially, these resolutions agreed to do nothing regarding the Cheyne judgement, except to claim the right "to hold & teach all such doctrine as was taught from the beginning by the undivided Church". [111] Moir and Thom, two key supporters within Forbes' diocese, were satisfied with the resolutions. [112] Forbes, however, was feeling less confident again, thinking that the publication of his charge, and his other efforts to raise the level of belief in the doctrines of the eucharist had been a failure. [113] Perhaps this was because Forbes knew that the consequences of the Laurencekirk meeting were not going as smoothly as Moir and others hoped. One of the signatories to the Laurencekirk resolutions, James Smith, Dean of Moray and incumbent of Forgue in the Diocese of Aberdeen, was to be dismissed by Eden of Moray as his dean and tried by Bishop Suther for his signing what Suther believed to be an act contumacious to his judgement in the Cheyne case. Forbes asked Boyle on 11 February 1859 to be a support for the dean as he himself could not, because if the case went to appeal Forbes could find himself one of Smith's judges. [114] Boyle responded on 21 February with an interesting assessment of the situation that revealed how much in the minority Cheyne (and therefore Forbes also) was in his theological opinions. According to Boyle most of the northern clergy did not support Cheyne's doctrines, and were content with a virtualist theology. Cheyne, wrote Boyle, was experiencing a:

> sad awakening; he fancied he had more nonjuring support & that a large number really held "the doctrines", he finds that while *many* with true Scottish caution "decline to commit themselves" to such a document [as the Laurencekirk declarations] or are fully prepared for a conflict between the "Second Order" & the First, the proportion of those who *really* hold the doctrines he taught is not great. [115]

That was also true, said Boyle, of Dean Smith who "*barely approves*" of Cheyne's teaching, but was prepared to stand trial for "constitutional liberty". Boyle concluded that the dean, "like most of our friends has a somewhat loose hold of the dogma". [116] Boyle had already advised Forbes in a letter the previous day that "very few even of the most zealous clergy wd. hold with Mr Cheyne...we are in a very complex state, our friends are *fewer and less consistent* than was once hoped". [117] With such a pessimistic but knowledgeable informant, it is not surprising that Forbes began to think his hopes were fading, and so Keble was once again the recipient of Forbes' "sad thoughts". [118]

There was a change at this time in the episcopal bench. Trower tendered his resignation on 3 February. Writing from Tunbridge Wells, he gave his inability to consult regularly during "the present tremendous conflict of opinion" as the reason for his resignation. [119] In his place the dean of the diocese, William Scot Wilson, whom Boyle described as a low churchman, was elected. [120] Forbes wrote to Wilson congratulating him on his election, and commented that, "in a small community like ours, our difficulties are much increased". [121]

Forbes had experienced "a solitary and trying Winter". His delicate health never found winter in Dundee easy at the best of times, and his doubts and difficulties had grown since the bishops' decision went against Cheyne. He told Gladstone on 8 April 1859 that he thought he had maintained his ground and was now trusting "to the truth and beauty of the doctrines I have so imperfectly

advocated, for their final triumph". [122] But this was small comfort when support for those doctrines, either as expressed by himself or Cheyne, was so poor. Apart from the watered-down Laurencekirk resolutions, the majority of his own clergy, one or two highly-placed friends like Boyle, or uncompromising militants such as the St. Ninian's clergy, Forbes had little support to show for those doctrines. Gladstone himself supported Forbes less for the cause of dogmatic truth, than because he believed the Cheyne judgement had changed the terms of communion. To have this change accomplished by "two or three men meeting together" was, according to Gladstone, "in reality a wild excess of the principle of private judgement although those men are bishops". For such a change to have occured "in a corner of a corner of the Christian world", only compounded the offence for Gladstone. [123]

Now that the flurry of action over the Cheyne judgement had died down, Forbes' possible trial assumed centre stage in the controversy. A proposed motion for the Brechin Diocesan Synod was causing concern among both his supporters and opponents. The motion came from Henry St. John Howard, incumbent of Laurencekirk, who proposed thanks to Forbes for "the firm stand he has made in the defence of the doctrine of the Real Presence". [124] Howard told Forbes in July that he offered his motion only in order to forestall anything more extreme coming from "some of the very Zealous Brethren", and that he would accept any amendment that would secure the support of the majority of the synod. [125]

But divisive synod motions were not the only diocesan trouble Forbes had to confront during 1859. Since the previous year Dean Moir had been experiencing increasing strife with his vestry at Brechin over his prominent support for Forbes and Cheyne. At the end of 1858, the vestry were withholding payment of Moir's

stipend and the matter was due to go before the civil courts. Forbes sent Moir money to help out and also passed on funds he received from various friends, including Keble. Then Moir informed Forbes in May 1859 that he believed William Henderson was interfering in his parish. The next month Moir wrote again, reporting a conversation he had with a parishioner, who said Henderson had visited her family, administered Holy Communion, and intended to visit them regularly. [126] For the rest of the year the Dean's troubles continued, with his prospective legal case being put off indefinitely.

Forbes was also experiencing dissension within the congregation at Fasque, due to the influence of the local landowner, Sir Thomas Gladstone, the older brother of William. Thomas Gladstone was an Evangelical, and he had pressured the candidates due to be confirmed at Fasque by Forbes, so that all but two had withdrawn. He also arranged to have his domestic servants confirmed by Bishop Suther in Aberdeen. [127] Forbes consequently gave notice that he intended to raise the matter at the Episcopal Synod that October. He drafted a letter to Suther disavowing any "material feeling against him", and said that he raised the issue "purely with a wish to know what are the powers of a Diocesan Bishop". [128] No doubt Forbes was genuinely concerned with the authority of the bishop in the Church, as he had demonstrated on a number of previous occasions his high view of diocesan episcopacy. But it must also have pleased him that one of his opponents had laid himself open to criticism on a matter that Forbes could present as distinct from the eucharistic controversy. Suther certainly showed a lack of political shrewdness when he agreed to confirm Fasque parishioners, but then his trial of Cheyne demonstrated Suther was not noted for cool reasoning. But Forbes was not without some personal vindictiveness in seizing a chance to deliver a riposte to one of his attackers. Despite Eden's attempts to mediate, commenting

acutely that the issue was suspect of "personal feeling", Forbes did not withdraw.

Forbes was having his problems in Montrose as well, where the living was in the hands of a local patron who was refusing to accept the preferred choice of the congregation, and Henderson's influence was suspected. The dispute was not settled until the influence of Dean Ramsay was brought to bear on the patron to accede to the congregation's choice. [129]

Henderson himself caused further turmoil by petitioning the Episcopal Synod for one of the other bishops to hold the Confirmation service at Arbroath. Forbes thought that even this challenge to the authority of a diocesan bishop would not weaken the "coalition" of bishops against him. "The Primus is all very well", he wrote to Boyle at the beginning of August 1859, "but I expect nothing of Glasgow, & Eden & Ewing are too weak to resist the impetuosity of S. Andrews". [130]

In the midst of all these anxieties Forbes was receiving some encouragement to persevere. Boyle passed on the view of one of the Dundee clergy that Forbes' position in the diocese was stronger than at the same time last year. [131] Pusey also wrote, to say that Forbes embodied his doctrine in his own person. "Your presence at Dundee", said Pusey, "in your see, is invaluable. It is like an army holding the field of battle after an engagement...To leave it, would be to imply defeat." [132] The bishop also received some rather spiteful comfort from his brother, who was clearly irritated that Alexander ventured to criticise the lack of progress on their joint edition of the Arbuthnott Missal. George said that while his brother had "troops of friends", he had "hardly a soul" to say a good word for him. He therefore considered he knew just what his brother was feeling. But if the bishop's teaching was right George was sure it would ultimately prevail. George

advised his brother to ignore Henderson, and to keep his temper, as long as possible. "If my idea of the man be correct, the more he thinks he is annoying you, the better pleased & the more persevering he will be." [133]

Forbes was now preparing for his 1859 diocesan synod. He decided not to put Howard's motion, as it "seemed likely to put me in a false position with my Presbyters". [134] By this Forbes meant he found it unacceptable that his clergy should approve his actions, as accepting their approval could also sanction their disapproval and imply their right to judge a bishop. Tractarian ecclesiology, which exalted the office of the bishop as a necessary part of the Catholic Church, would appear to have exacerbated an authoritarian side to Forbes' nature. But he did accede to the advice of Keble and Judge Coleridge, and relinquished his plan to give a second charge at the synod, on the "Real Objective Presence".

The Brechin synod met on 3 August 1859, with thirteen clergy and the chancellor present. But Forbes was conscious of a wider audience, because he permitted the admission of a reporter in order "to procure a full and correct report". [135] In his lengthy address Forbes first touched upon Cheyne's appeal. While he considered the sentence excessively severe and lacking in logic, he was careful to point out that such criticism did not imply that he disputed the authority of the Episcopal Synod. He mentioned he had intended to include some further theological points, but in the interests of peace he had decided to postpone this to a better time. "In a small Communion like ours", he told his audience, "men are led to take sides in every question that may arise". More words, he felt, would not alter the convictions on either side. After mentioning his own appeal against Bishop Suther, Forbes read a letter he had received from Henderson in reply to his own, regarding Forbes' intention to confirm at Arbroath. Henderson had replied he had

no candidates at present, and he had thought the bishop was holding his right to confirm at Arbroath in abeyance for the present. Forbes could not let such a challenge to episcopal authority go unremarked, and said that although the matter was before the Episcopal Synod he nevertheless took this opportunity "emphatically to disclaim any ceding of my authority". Howard then moved his motion and the bishop said he had decided it should not be put, because its terms were "unnecessarily antagonistic, but also upon a more particular and personal ground...the right of praise implied the right of blame". He said he was willing to put another motion that did not offend in these ways. Robert Thom then moved, that the synod confessed its faith that in the eucharist there was "a Presence, not of power and efficacy alone, but moreover a real and essential, though at the same time Spiritual, ineffable, and sacramental presence of our Lord". The motion concluded, that while the clergy were ready to be obedient to the Church's highest authorities, they deprecated any action which narrowed the interpretation of the formularies, or attempted to secure the monoply of a single interpretation. Howard seconded this motion and it was carried, with Henderson as the sole objector. [136] The voting on this motion demonstrates the extent to which Forbes' standing in his diocese had improved since his early years. In a similar contest of strength in the synod, over the prayer book of Bishop Torry in 1850, opponents had been able to muster sufficient votes to defeat a motion supporting the book, which Forbes and his family favoured. This time, eight years later, Forbes' support in the synod was overwhelming.

The Episcopal Synod in October had to come to grips with various issues which, while subsidiary to Forbes' presentment for trial, were a consequence of the greater dispute as the protagonists became more firmly divided. Aside from Forbes' unread "eirenic" letter the previous December, there had been little attempt to find

a compromise or resolution over his charge. The long-running argument was generating further ill-will and dissension, as the parties scored points off one another. Terrot, the primus, commented on the "almost personal estrangement among us". [137] When the synod convened on 6 October a motion was passed to erase from the minutes Forbes' protest over the Cheyne judgement because it set a poor legal precedent for a judge to protest at the majority's decision in addition to giving his own minority judgement. [138] This cannot have perturbed Forbes too greatly. He had already explained to Terrot that his purpose in protesting was to "free his own mind", and he had done this. It was therefore "of no great consequence" to him whether this protest was recorded in the minutes or not. [139] Regarding Suther's confirming Fasque parishioners, Terrot said that if people had recourse to bishops according to their dogmatic preferences it would split the Church into low and high parties. Terrot said Suther was wrong both in not communicating beforehand with Forbes, and in interfering at all. Suther at first objected, but then agreed that if had broken any rule he would not do so again. Forbes expressed his satisfaction with this outcome of his appeal. [140] The October synod also attended to the presentment against Forbes. He was directed to lodge his answer to the presentment with the clerk of the synod by 7 January 1860. Parties to the trial were to attend the synod on 7 February. Forbes asked for a delay of six months because he said his parochial work in Dundee was, next to Aberdeen, the heaviest in the Episcopal Church. Bishop Wordsworth said the agitated state of the Church did not warrant the extra interval, and as Forbes had republished his charge, he could surely master the subject in three months. Having made his protest, Forbes accepted the decision. [141]

Forbes now began to make preparations to answer the presentment. On 11 October 1859 the historian George Grub agreed to be his legal counsel. [142] Grub

was then lecturer in Scots law at King's College, Aberdeen. He had been born in Aberdeen in 1812 and came from a nonjuring Episcopalian family. His biographer remembers that while he was equally learned in theology as history, and the only contemporary theology he read was the Tractarians, but "he stopped short of the Eucharistic views of Bishop Forbes and Mr. Cheyne". [143] In his brief to Grub, Forbes stated he did not want to take advantage of any "legal subtlety". He said Grub could state the injustice Forbes felt at being tried two years after his supposed offence, and that he considered the bishops had already prejudged him, but he was not to press this. Forbes did not want anything to come in the way of "the freest ventilation of the subject". The bishop went on to say that the advice he had already received from Sir John Coleridge, that these doctrines were within the toleration of the Church, seemed good to him though, personally, Forbes would wish to claim them as the revealed and Catholic truth. Forbes was, however, willing to argue for them before the bishops on this lesser ground, but he desired Grub "to keep this distinction in view". As for the theological argument against the presentment, Forbes explained he had divided the preparation of this among various friends. [144] Bright and Liddon would cover the Anglican theology and the liturgical objections, while Pusey took the patristic parts. They would consult with Forbes by post from Oxford, or by the new electric telegraph. The remainder would be left to Forbes himself. [145] Pusey was worried about Forbes' penchant for scholastic terminology, which he thought would not help make his defence easily intelligible. [146]

At this stage Pusey thought the likely outcome of the presentment would be Forbes' condemnation. [147] Keble was counselling Forbes against those who believed a schism to be the only way of upholding the eucharistic doctrine. He commented that such a schism, "for such as believe as we do", would require a

bishop to head it, and as he understood it Forbes would "hardly think it right to be that bishop". Keble's advice was that if sentenced to deprivation Forbes could submit, and continue to work in the Church under protest, at least until such time as the formularies were altered. [148] Forbes was considering his options, which did include "setting his diocese against the Church". By this Pusey understood him to mean that most of his clergy in Brechin diocese would remain loyal to him if he resigned, so that no other Bishop of Brechin could be elected if he decided to hold the see despite being condemned or deprived by the Episcopal Synod. This is a measure of how desperate Forbes was becoming. In effect, he was considering leading a schism of his own clergy, although he had previously warned hotter heads than his own against it. He usually thought that a simple resignation was a more effective and dignified protest. As for resigning, Pusey advised him not to commit himself until he had consulted with Keble and himself. [149] At first Pusey did not think Forbes serious about such an option, but a further letter from the bishop that October made him less sure. Forbes had written that his heart "revolts from schism", but that no orthodox bishop in the fourth century would have given up his see to an Arian heretic. This was one of the many allusions Forbes made to the Arian heresy, in which he identified his cause with the defence of the Nicene faith by the orthodox Athanasius, who suffered deprivation and exile but was ultimately triumphant. Forbes added, "we must think on the Future; for, of course, I fall not alone. My Dean and many of the Orthodox, fall with me". At this time, Forbes evidently also thought his condemnation the most likely outcome of the trial. The moral pressure on Forbes may have been increased by Pusey suggesting his defence was also important for the Tractarian cause in England. Pusey mused to Keble that possibly a successful "persecution" of Forbes in Scotland would become a ground "for persecution in England, so that he [Forbes] might think of himself as fighting the battle of the Faith in England". [150]

Forbes decided to go south to make a start on his defence, where he could be away from parish duties and consult personally with Keble and Pusey. He arranged to spend nearly two weeks with Keble and then move to Pusey at Christ Church on 24 October, where he intended to stay until the Episcopal Synod reconvened over Cheyne's appeal on 9 November. [151] Soon after he had arrived at Keble's vicarage at Hursley, Forbes had news that the primus had intervened directly in the controversy for the first time since the declaration of the three bishops in December 1857. Terrot had approached the Brechin chancellor, Alexander Forbes Irvine, through a private letter, to see if there was a possibility of Forbes and the bishops agreeing to a compromise theological formula. Terrot probably made his approach though Forbes Irvine, rather than directly to Forbes, because he wanted to keep the negotiation informal at that stage. He had been prompted to make the approach, Terrot said, because a large proportion of Church people believed the continuation of the controversy was dangerous to the peace of the Church. Terrot would therefore welcome any "reasonable overture" that could give the bishops an opportunity to decline to pursue the presentment. He claimed he was not the only bishop to wish for a peaceful resolution. While he did not think Forbes' opinions were heretical, Terrot objected to them being taught as the official teaching of the Episcopal Church. To do so, he thought, would be to call into suspicion the beliefs not only of the present bishops, but of their predecessors as well. He explained in his letter to Forbes Irvine that he was not asking Forbes to recant, but queried if Forbes could agree to the following: to express regret that the form in which his opinions were published (that is, a diocesan charge) had caused misunderstanding; he repudiated transubstantiation and consubstantiation; and he would henceforth "abstain from claiming for such statements as have been repudiated by the College of Bishops, the authority of the Scottish branch of the reformed Catholic Church". Terrot said he was not "prescribing" a particular form

to be adopted, but only indicating what he thought would prevent judicial proceedings and disruption in the Church. [152]

Forbes Irvine forwarded a copy of the primus' letter to Forbes on 18 October, without revealing Terrot's identity. The chancellor said he was anxious to keep it quiet lest their uncompromising "Perth friends" from St. Ninian's found out, and the whole thing became public in the *Union*. [153] Forbes showed the letter to Keble who thought the overture a satisfactory one, understanding it as an agreement to let each party retain their opinions. Keble told Pusey that if this approach of Terrot's was unsuccessful, Forbes was thinking of submitting to suspension, as Pusey did when his university sermon was condemned in 1843, but remaining in Dundee and working privately. [154] When Forbes arrived at Christ Church a few days later Pusey found him in "pretty good spirits", comforted by his visit to Keble. [155] The next day Forbes wrote to Boyle regarding Terrot's letter. Realising the identity of Forbes Irvine's correspondent, Forbes said he could not entirely agree with what the primus asked. [156] Forbes was also having difficulties with his defence - that is, in keeping it concise - but he turned from that to reply to Terrot, through Forbes Irvine. Forbes wrote that he did not see any "insurmountable difficulty" in what was asked of him, as Terrot did not press for a recantation. He was willing to say, as his charge did, that he rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation. He adhered *ex animo* to the formularies of the Church, and he regretted anything in the *form* of his charge which had caused offence. Finally, explaining that he did not make his doctrines mandatory in his diocese, he said he did not put them on a level with those required for salvation. He personally believed they were sanctioned by the Church, but acknowledged that other divines had not thought so, and neither did the Episcopal Synod. [157]

In one of his draft replies to Terrot during this negotiation Forbes used words which indicate, even more clearly than in his actual first reply, that his major concern was to avoid a formula which suggested he repudiated the doctrinal authorization of the Church for his teaching. He wrote that:

> of all I have taught some points are expressly sanctioned by the letter of the said formularies - others are but the logical consequences of the same. I therefore must claim for my various propositions such authority as is consistent with this view. There is, besides, the sanction which I believe my teaching possesses as a whole from those "Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops" to whose judgement the Anglican Communion confidently defers. [158]

This question, the sanction of the Church for his teaching, was paramount in Forbes' mind to retain in his negotiation with Terrot. Failure to realise it became the sticking point of the whole negotiation, as the primus gradually retreated from his first position of not insisting on a particular form of words and pressed Forbes to repudiate his claim to the authority of the Church, to which Forbes tenaciously clung.

Boyle had suggested to Forbes that public opinion in the Church was against him, and perhaps mindful of this the bishop published an open letter to his congregation. Written from Oxford on 5 November 1859, he said he desired to defend himself from the accusation of "depraving the teaching of the Church". He did so in his usual way of citing a selection of three supporting Anglican divines (Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Ken and Thomas Wilson), as proof texts. In his original charge he was motivated, he said, even beyond the duty to truth, by "the union of Christians". He believed he was writing in such a way as would "induce men to look upon the most mysterious and blessed doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in a devotional and uncontroversial way". He finished by thanking his congregation for their calm and their consideration. [159]

When a partisan supporter reviewed this letter in *The Ecclesiastic* in December 1859, Forbes wrote to the journal to remonstrate against the reviewer's criticism of Wordsworth. The reviewer had accused Wordsworth of jealousy over the success of Forbes' work in Dundee which, the review claimed, was the only part of Scotland where the Episcopal Church had made any progress among the native Scots and the poor. [160] In his letter to the editor on 5 December 1859, (published in *The Ecclesiastic* in January 1860), Forbes replied that his work in Dundee was not achieved without assistance, nor was it the only bright spot for the Episcopal Church in Scotland. While he deplored the line Wordsworth had taken in the controversy, it did not blind him to his many good qualities, especially his work at Trinity College. "It is one of the evils of controversy", Forbes concluded, "that we become inclined to undervalue the good in those to whom for the moment we are opposed". [161] But, to Gladstone, Forbes expressed his opinion that Wordsworth not only dominated and controlled the other bishops, but that his dislike for Forbes had become a fixed idea with him. Privately, Forbes was prepared to acknowledge to trusted friends he thought Wordsworth a pernicious influence upon his opponents, but in public Forbes probably did not want to harm Terrot's negotiation by further antagonising the influential Wordsworth. Forbes also explained to Gladstone that he had little hope of the negotiation succeeding, but he thought it was right to do everything "consistent with truth in the way of explanation". To do so could be a way of demonstrating his good will to all "calm & thoughtful people" if it came to a trial. He went on:

> I am much at a loss what to do in the event of condemnation. So far as regards my own comfort I should be thankful to be out of this, for I find it a great mistake to belong to a small religious community, but then I think of the poor souls entrusted to me in this large manufacturing town and the still considerable numbers of clergy of straitened means who might feel called upon to follow whatever example I might set them. All this rather points at resistance - but perhaps it is unwise to anticipate evil. [162]

This is the first hint of Forbes' dissatisfaction with the Episcopal Church, although

on a number of previous occasions he had mentioned that its smallness exacerbated divisions. What prevented him from taking some drastic action in regard to this dissatisfaction was his work in Dundee, and his clergy. He strongly believed he was responsible for both before God, and that his clergy, most of whom (unlike himself) were married and had no income independent of their stipends, were less able than he was to leave their livings.

The reconvened Episcopal Synod on 9 November 1859, judging the appeals of Smith and another from Cheyne, interrupted the progress of the negotiation. All the bishops but Forbes dismissed Smith's appeal, agreeing that Eden had acted within his prerogative. Cheyne's final appeal was again dismissed by all except Forbes. Cheyne was asked if he was then willing to submit to the sentence of suspension and to retract. He replied he was willing to submit, but not under the form of words prescribed. He was then pronounced "to be no longer a clergyman of the Episcopal Church" until such time as he asked for restoration in accordance with canon 41. [163]

On receipt of Forbes' first reply to Terrot, Forbes Irvine, as intermediary, had an interview with the primus on 15 November. He reported to Forbes that Terrot liked much of Forbes' letter, but thought it fell short of being able to secure agreement. Terrot reminded Forbes Irvine that he had to answer to Henderson, as well as the bishops, and that some of these were "less disposed to be friendly than himself". Forbes Irvine enclosed a form of words which alone, he said, would satisfy Terrot. [164] Pusey however dismissed the formula because it said nothing about Forbes not retracting, but even more because it looked like a submission. [165] Pusey explained to Keble that the core of the problem was that Forbes "could not bear saying that he had not the authority of the Scotch Church".

Pusey also told Keble that when he had suggested to Forbes he could only claim such authority for his teaching insofar as the Episcopal Church was "a branch of the Church Catholic", Forbes could not bear it, got "excited", and said, "It is all that unhappy Reformation". [166] This was a significant incident. Forbes became unhappy and agitated when Pusey suggested that the basis for Forbes' claim to the dogmatic authority of the Episcopal Church for his (Catholic) teaching lay in that Church being a part of the Catholic Church. Forbes' reply was to become excited and blame the Reformation, presumably for what he considered as the nonCatholic and Protestant theology of the other bishops. Did Forbes' agitation spring from the feeling that the presence of such diverse theological views was beginning, for him, to cast doubt on the claim of his Church to be a branch of the Catholic Church? This possibility is supported by Keble's reply that "the worst of it is the way in which our friend seems predisposed to throw it [the failure of Forbes' response to Terrot] on the Anglican Divines". [167] Was Keble saying that Forbes blamed the Anglican Divines for being able to be claimed by both sides by their not being explicit enough in favour of his own, supposed Catholic, teaching? If so, this period of the controversy represents the beginning of a major shift in Forbes' outlook. Previously Forbes, like Keble and the Tractarians generally, believed the Anglican divines could be appealed to as upholders of Catholic doctrine. It suggests that the controversy was slowly eroding Forbes' confidence in the Episcopal Church, and perhaps in the position of the whole Anglican Church as well. Pusey's comment that Forbes was "so very sensitive about authority" indicates a personal, and not just a theological involvement, with this particular concern. Keble opined that Forbes be encouraged not to give way to his fear of apostasy, or what Keble called his "marked fear of offering up incense to Jupiter". [168]

Forbes sent his second reply to the primus on 23 November. It was much shorter than his first one, but still longer than Terrot wanted. Forbes began by explicitly disclaiming any retraction, believing his teaching conformable to scripture, the Fathers, and Anglican formularies and divines. He did agree to regret that the form in which he expressed that teaching had led to misapprehension about its authority, and again denied transubstantiation and consubstantiation. Finally, he said that while his doctrine of sacrifice flowed from that of the Real Presence, claiming it to be "the natural meaning of the Scottish Office" and eucharistic adoration of Christ as the "legitimate consequence of the Real Presence", he stated he did not desire to force these beliefs on others, nor had he done so. [169] But Terrot found this response even less satisfactory than the first. He now presented Forbes with virtually an ultimatum. Unless Forbes was prepared to sign the formula Terrot had given, or something "substantially" the same, the negotiation would cease. Terrot particularly desired to have Forbes' words about claiming the support of the formularies omitted. [170]

On 21 December Forbes sent his third response to the primus. He wrote to Gladstone the same day that he had "less hope" than Gladstone did of receiving "friendly treatment". Forbes could not accept all the suggestions Gladstone had made (in a long letter following Gladstone's visit to Edinburgh on 10 December for installation as rector of the university). He did agree to exclude a disclaimer of retraction, and to omit his explanations of transubstantiation and consubstantiation. But he wanted to retain the claim that his teaching was agreeable to Anglican authorities, as "a *residuum*" of the degree of authority he alleged for his teaching. His desire was not just to make peace, he said, but to do so in a way compatible with the consciences of his supporters. [171] Forbes Irvine was happy to report that with this last paper "there was now some prospect of peace". The primus, he

reported, thought it "would answer the end for which it was asked", with a few small textual alterations. There exists, in the Brechin Diocesan Archives, a draft in Forbes' hand, including Terrot's desired changes, with a note by Forbes that "this was the paper finally agreed on with the Primus - in the abortive negociation". This paper, as ultimately sent, read as follows:

> The Bishop of Brechin regrets that the *form* in which his opinions were published has given occasion to misapprehension of his real meaning on certain points in the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. He disbelieves and rejects the Tridentine Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the alleged Lutheran Doctrine of Consubstantiation, which has been described as holding Christ really but invisibly moulded up with the substance of the *Elements*. While he firmly believes what he has taught, rightly understood, to be in conformity with the Word of God, and with our own Formularies, as interpreted by the light of the early Church, and that it is sanctioned by divers of our own esteemed Divines, he has never claimed for it the dogmatic sanction of the Scottish Branch of the Reformed Catholic Church, in the sense that that Church required it to be received as Terms of Communion, nor has he required it as a condition of ordination or communion, nor will he hereafter so require it. [172]

Forbes was now suffering from insomnia, which was not helped by the thought of what his radical supporters, such as those writing in the *Union*, would think when news of the negotiation became known. But Keble believed these would never be satisfied with any thing less than a statement which would even exclude Hooker from the Catholic Church. [173] Boyle said he would do his best to "gag" the *Union*, having previously been a proprietor of the paper. [174] Pusey, Bright and Boyle were all hopeful of Forbes' final statement bringing an end to the threat of a possible trial, although they were unhappy about Forbes calling the teaching of the charge his "opinions". Keble wrote again, as so often, to calm Forbes' troubled spirit over what he had done. "I know something of your sensitive heart", he wrote, "& your very tender conscience; & my own heart aches to think of what you may be suffering at any moment from a sort of indistinct fear that you may have inadvertently conceded too much, & so far been wanting to the cause to wch.

your heart & life are devoted." [175] But Forbes was hearing such reports of Wordsworth's "bitter animosity" towards him that he told Gladstone he would not be surprised if something upset this hope of peace, although Forbes thought the primus had behaved "very well". [176] Terrot, meanwhile, had forwarded a copy of Forbes' paper to all the bishops, asking if it could be received as an interim defence. On 30 December 1859 he wrote to Forbes to say he was sorry, but he had received "very decided letters in the negative". Terrot explained that the opinion of the other bishops was that the college could not "by private correspondence" set aside a legal presentment. The bishops were also not as favourable as Terrot had been towards Forbes' statement. The primus concluded that it was "impossible for me now to say what would satisfy them", but to do so would require far more from Forbes than he had agreed hitherto. [177] Forbes drew the right conclusion; advising Gladstone of the outcome of the negotiation he commented, "the Trial must now take its course". [178] But Forbes himself was not completely disappointed at this prospect. He confessed to Boyle that he had "a sort of feeling of relief, for I do not like these negociations on matters of faith". While he thought he was now facing possible suspension, he said he had to consider if he had "a duty to the souls in Dundee antecedent to all Canons & Formularies". [179] Forbes was evidently planning to continue working in Dundee should he be suspended because Bright reported that in such an outcome Forbes said he would stay "and work the hospital". [180] At the same time Forbes wrote a letter that Keble described as "agonized" with remorse at having assented to the proposed arrangement. [181] Pusey wrote to Forbes to assure him that:

> there is no fear of your being like Liberius.* This is the mere tension of

---

* Liberius was pope from 352-366. In 357 he submitted to the Arian emperor Constantius and signed an Arian formula of faith in order to be permitted to return to his see after two years of exile. He had been exiled for initially refusing to condemn Athanasius.

> nerves, a mere phantom...You really must either not have read, or have forgotten the miserable history of Liberius to think that anything you do would be like him. But is it not after all, that you are torn between the love of your people at Dundee on the one side, and the wish to get free altogether of the Scotch Episcopate? [182]

Pusey also wrote to Keble on 4 January 1860 that he had much the same sort of letter from Forbes, and that he thought it might be due to a "deep wound that after teaching for his eleven years of most strength, so few of his people really do go along with his belief". [183]

In January 1860 there came another attempt to prevent a trial, this time by influential laymen. Twenty-three such men, headed by the Duke of Buccleuch, signed a memorial to Forbes. They proposed that the presentment not be prosecuted if Forbes could agree to abide by the words of Bishops Taylor, Ken and Wilson, whom he had quoted in his congregational letter the previous November. If he did this, and public ly denied opposing the Episcopal Synod, the memorialists were confident the presenters would withdraw. Essentially the conditions of the memorial were the same as Bishop Wordsworth had set out in his *Proposals for Peace**, published in December. Both proposals had seized on Forbes' claim in his letter to St. Paul's that in his charge he had not gone beyond the words of these three bishops. Wordsworth considered this meant Forbes affirmed that he restricted his teaching to that of these three divines. From that premise Wordsworth sought

---

* In his *Proposals for Peace* Wordsworth also inferred that a cause of the controversy was Forbes' sympathy towards Roman Catholicism:

> I do not ask the Bishop of Brechin to show himself as plain-spoken respecting the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome as Bishop Taylor, Bishop Ken, and Bishop Wilson showed themselves in their respective times; for some persons now-a-days appear to think that the spirit and policy of the Church of Rome are changed, and that our policy, therefore, ought to be changed toward her. For my own part, I confess I see no sufficient reason for this opinion; rather I see the contrary. [C.Wordsworth, *Proposals for Peace*, (1859), 24-5.]

to show Forbes had indeed gone beyond what these bishops taught on the eucharist. Whether Wordsworth was correct or not, his was an unwaranted assumption about the congregational letter. In his reply to the memorialists Forbes said he had quoted the three divines simply because they exactly expressed his beliefs. He acknowledged that the divines had written modifications of the particular passages he quoted, but this, Forbes suggested, was surely an argument for the toleration of differing views. As regards the Episcopal Synod, Forbes said that while he had felt duty-bound to separate himself from some of its decisions, he had never sought to undermine its authority. In support of this contention he referred to what he had said about the synod in his address to the Brechin synod the previous year. [184]

Forbes lodged his formal reply to the presentment by the due date of 7 January. Bishop Wilson, as synod clerk, then forwarded one copy to the presenters, and retained the other for the Episcopal Synod. [185] Forbes began by questioning the credentials of the presenters - one of the two laymen because he was a recent convert to Episcopalianism, and Henderson because he had lost the election as Bishop of Brechin, which suggested he was motivated by jealousy and envy. Forbes also raised questions about the impartiality of the bishops as his judges. He argued that the issue at trial was whether the specific passages of his charge referred to in the presentment were contrary to the Thirty Nine Articles, and also, by consequence, to the authorities the Articles referred to - scripture, and the liturgy of the Church. Unless this could be proved, Forbes said, the presentment had to be dismissed. As in his charge, Forbes was maintaining his argument that the Articles were not the sole "authoritative documents" for Anglican doctrine. He then proceeded to defend himself against the accusations of the presentment in the order they were made. With regard to his teaching that the eucharist was a sacrifice substantially the same as the cross, Forbes drew a distinction between "active"

sacrifice, which was the actual "act of sacrifice or offering", and "passive" sacrifice or "that which is offered". The former, he said, was Calvary, the historical act of Christ's sacrifice which was perfect and unrepeatable; the latter was Christ's continual offering to the Father. "I do not mean that the *acts* are identical, but the *Thing Offered* is identical, even the One Body of the Holy Lord; and that, on the Cross, in its natural mode of being, in the Sacrament truly and substantially present, but not after the natural mode of the existence of a body." [186] Forbes argued that the active sacrifice of Christ on Calvary was passively perpetuated as an atoning offering by the memorial of the eucharist Christ commanded his disciples to make. He repeated his understanding of memorial as the continual making-present by the eucharist of that which is offered [Christ] - this passive sacrifice deriving from Christ's active sacrifice [the historic and unrepeatable act of the cross]. [187] As regards the interpretation in the presentment of Article 31, (which said Christ's sacrifice was "finished"), so as to exclude an oblation of Christ subsequent to his death, Forbes considered that this would bring the Article into conflict with the Epistle to the Hebrews which spoke of Christ's continual offering in heaven. "All Eucharists...are but one act of oblation, in union with, and dependent upon, the Cross, even as the Great Oblation in Heaven is but one act with a like union and dependence." [188] Against imputations of teaching Roman Catholic doctrine, Forbes said he taught *"a real, though not a local, Objective Presence, not by way of Transubstantiation"*. [189] Referring to objections that he had disparaged the teaching of the Nonjurors, and therefore of important Episcopal divines, he claimed his usual critical appreciation of this group.

> I am not the person to undervalue their testimony to truth and honesty. Brought up as I have been from an early youth with an hereditary veneration for the House of Stuart, and, as I believe, being the only Bishop in the College who, from family associations, has an historical connexion with that unfortunate House, I am not likely to depreciate their testimony...but it is no true kindness to their memory to place their testimony in an unduly prominent position. They are but one school of opinion within the Anglican Church,

> though a school that deserves much consideration from the piety, learning, and self-sacrifice of its adherents." [190]

Forbes was reminding the bishops and his opponents that his personal connections with the nonjuring Episcopal past were stronger than theirs, and at the same time reducing the importance of nonjuring theology which was predominantly virtualist. Forbes then turned to the second accusation, that in upholding the eucharistic adoration of Christ he was contravening Article 28, ["the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped"]. He said he had never argued that the eucharist was by Christ's ordinance to be worshipped. Forbes drew an analogy from the Episcopalian practice of reservation of the eucharist for the communion of the sick. He said this was practised despite the article denying the eucharist had been instituted to be reserved, therefore, the statement about the eucharist not being instituted to be worshipped must be similarly limited. Forbes believed the article was actually directed against Roman Catholic devotional practices such as the Corpus Christi procession, and said he had condemned these in his charge. He therefore claimed toleration for his teaching. "I can readily understand...a strong fear of paying, or seeming to pay, to this outward symbol a reverence due to God Alone...I condemn no one, and desire only that they who, with myself, follow what I believe to be an instinct of our spiritual natures, should not be condemned." [191] Regarding the third charge, that he had contravened Article 29 by teaching that "in some sense" the unfaithful receive Christ if proceeding to holy communion, Forbes argued that to be or not to be "a partaker of Christ" [Article 28] must refer only to a beneficial reception of holy communion, and this was perfectly compatible with his teaching that the unworthy receive a detrimental reception, to their judgement. Forbes alleged it was his opponents who claimed an exclusive theological interpretation, not himself. "He [the Respondent] has not separated from those who hold different opinions from

himself. It was not he who refused to confirm at Arbroath or at Fasque...The Respondent only claims for himself the liberty which he freely allows to others." [192] He shrewdly turned the bishops' fears of alienating the Church of England against them. If he was condemned, Forbes argued, the communion between the Episcopal Church and the Church of England was at an end. He said his opinions were held by many in the Church of England, including some in high places, and they went unmolested. His condemnation would make it evident that the two Churches had different terms of communion. "It is quite needless for the respondent to point out the fatal consequences of such a state of things." [193] He finally concluded his massive defence in ringing tones.

> The difference between the Presenters and myself is that they, I fear, do not believe what I with my whole heart believe - the real, supernatural Presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, yea, of CHRIST Himself, my Lord and my GOD, in that Holy Sacrament...I have not attempted to force upon others this my belief, dearer though it is to me than my life itself...This is the hope for which I am this day called in question...*credidi propter quod loquutus sum*. "I believed, and therefore I have spoken". [194]

Soon after Forbes had submitted his defence Wordsworth offered yet another means to avoid a trial. On 20 January 1860 he wrote to Forbes proposing that Forbes publicly withdraw his charge and state his desire to avoid giving offence in the future. In return, Wordsworth said he would attempt to persuade the bishops to withdraw all the parts of the Pastoral Letter which censured the charge. Wordsworth felt the presenters would find this acceptable and therefore the presentment would not be prosecuted. Forbes was constrained to reply, "to withdraw my charge would be to withdraw my whole teaching on the subject of the Holy Euch. and I am sure you cd. not ask me to do what wd. be agst. my conscience". [195] It seems strange that Wordsworth should propose such an arrangement when he was presumably one of those who terminated Terrot's former negotiation by arguing they could not, by private correspondence, set aside a legal presentment.

With the trial now imminent Pusey begged-off attending as he was afraid Wordsworth's antagonism toward him would not help. He also thought that "the Scottish Bishops dislike what they call English influence, which is what most of them (being Englishmen) are using against the poor Scotch Church". [196] The use of the same influence could also be charged to Forbes, only his English Tractarian friends were not as influential in the ecclesiastical institution as the High Church contacts of the other bishops. Pusey proposed that Forbes should contact him by telegraph if he needed to consult him during the proceedings. Keble however thought otherwise. He "could not be happy", he wrote to Forbes, with the thought of the bishop being left "unsupported by us, who have brought you in the way of trouble". Keble still felt responsible for encouraging Forbes' charge in the first place, so he travelled up to Edinburgh and arrived on the morning of the trial. [197]

On a very cold winter's morning Forbes' trial began in the Freemason s' Hall in Edinburgh on 7 February 1860. It was snowing when Forbes, Keble and two others had earlier gone to celebrate Holy Communion in the chapel of the House of Mercy in Lauriston Lane. [198] Forbes was accompanied at the trial by his legal advisers Forbes Irvine and Grub. Henderson advised the bishops sitting as judges that he was acting on behalf of the other two presenters who had asked to be excused; David Smith because of illness in his family, and Patrick Wilson due to his advanced age making a journey in winter inadvisable. [199] The primus asked if the remarks by Forbes in his *Answers* about the extra-judicial involvement of the bishops meant he questioned the competency of the court. Forbes replied that he wanted these things to be known, but made no formal objection. When the court resumed in the afternoon the bishops felt it necessary to respond to Forbes' questions about their pre-trial involvement in the controversy. They said unlike the

civil judiciary the bishops had a double jurisdiction, as the Episcopal Church's supreme court and as diocesan bishops responsible for all matters of doctrine and discipline. They did not believe that acting in the latter capacity precluded them from doing so in the former. They therefore directed that this part of Forbes' defence be omitted as irrelevant. [200] Bishop Eden then rose and questioned his own impartiality and his right to judge. He said he had not changed his mind since he had agreed to the Pastoral Letter, which declared Forbes' teaching erroneous, and therefore considered he had prejudged the case. Eden asked Forbes if he had an objection to him as a judge and Forbes replied that he did not, since the majority of the bishops had decided they were not so disqualified. Eden consequently decided to continue. [201] Forbes now read his *Answers* to the presentment, which went on though the afternoon of the 7 February, until the end of the following day.

During all of the 9 February, the third day of the trial, the bishops listened to Henderson's *Pleadings against the Answers*. Henderson defended himself against Forbes' accusations by saying he had objected to Forbes' election as Bishop of Brechin because of his youth and inexperience. He believed this objection could now be seen to be well-founded because of the present disorganized state of the diocese. [202] His presentment, he said, was an act of "strong necessity", only taken after the failure of his request for another bishop than Forbes to administer confirmation at Arbroath. It was only then, said Henderson, that Forbes' teaching directly clashed with his own at Arbroath. [203] He went on to allege that Forbes had contradicted Article 31, because to speak of the eucharist as sacrifice "identical" to the cross meant the cross was perpetuated, salvation was incomplete, and Christ's sacrifice was insufficient for atonement.

Henderson then stated what he considered the basic question to be proved at the trial. He argued that it was sufficient for him to prove Forbes' teaching contrary to the Thirty Nine Articles alone, because these were the Church's "standard authority". Henderson stated the question at issue was not "whether the doctrine propounded be in accordance with Scripture and the Fathers, but whether it was agreeable or repugnant to the Articles", and he dismissed Forbes' arguments from sources other than the Articles as strictly irrelevant. [204]

Returning to Forbes' teaching on eucharistic sacrifice, Henderson dismissed the argument about the sacrifice of Christ being perpetuated through memorial as a contradiction. A memorial, Henderson claimed, was a "remembrancer" or a reminder of something and not the thing itself. In the same vein he dismissed Forbes' distinction between an "active" and a "passive" sacrifice. To Henderson this distinction amounted to little or nothing. Calvary and the eucharist both involved Christ so Henderson concluded there was, in Forbes' terms, an active identity, so that the eucharist became a repetition of Calvary, contrary to Article 31. Regarding eucharistic adoration, Henderson alleged that Forbes taught the worship of the external bread and wine, because he used "the blessed sacrament" and "the Body and Blood of Christ" as interchangeable terms. [205] He then undermined the basis of his own argument that he needed to prove Forbes contrary to the Articles alone, by taking the trouble to allege Forbes also contradicted the catechism and the rubrics of the prayer book. [206] Henderson charged that Forbes' teaching led to Roman Catholic devotions, although the "more extravagant Romish demonstrations are to be prudently withheld in the meantime". [207] Clearly concern about the Roman Catholic direction of Forbes' theology was uppermost in Henderson's mind. "In these days of Romanising propensities", he complained, the clergy had a right to expect of a bishop a "ringing protest" against this doctrine, which in Roman

Catholicism had led to what Henderson called "idolatry". [208] Forbes' words that the unworthy "do in some sense" receive Christ in holy communion contravened Articles 28 and 29, which asserted that faith was necessary in order to receive Christ, and as the wicked are those without faith they could not therefore receive him. [209] He then charged Forbes with devaluing the teaching of the Church, because he did not base his arguments upon her theological standards and proceed from there, but rather began with his own teaching and endeavoured to make the Articles and other formularies fit that. [210] Henderson concluded by stating that an honest assent to the theological standards of the Church was expected by Churchpeople. Forbes had not done this in his teaching because he taught Roman Catholic doctrine and therefore, threatened the Church with Roman error. Henderson considered Forbes' own devoted work in Dundee only increased his influence. The Church had to act against Forbes because, Henderson implied, his present position enabled him to enforce these heresies.

> It is when the promulgator of unsound doctrines, while gifted with genius and eloquence is adorned with piety and virtue, and invested with official authority and influence to enforce the opinions which he sincerely holds as of essential importance, that the truth really is in danger, and interference on the part of its Guardians imperatively called for. [211]

In the theological battle throughout the controversy, both sides addressed questions of presence and sacrifice in isolation from their eucharistic context. None of the participants in the controversy was at all influenced by the contemporary renewal of eucharistic theology beginning in Europe, in the Catholic faculty of the University of Tubingen, and in the beginnings of the Liturgical Movement associated with the Abbey of Solesmes. Consequently the controversy on both sides perpetuated the old scholastic isolation of these questions.

At the end of the 9 February (no doubt to the relief of the bishops), Forbes asked for two weeks to prepare his reply. The court was adjourned to 14 March, and Forbes was to lodge his rejoinder with Bishop Wilson by 23 February. [212] During the adjournment Boyle gave Pusey an impression of events so far. "The influential laity of the `Protestant´ school have no relish for *individual severities* and *proscriptions*". But he hinted that Forbes' defence had not had the immediate impact they hoped, while Henderson's *Pleadings* had produced a "great impression". [213] Pusey thought Forbes was still worrying about acting the part of a modern Liberius, and was "terribly afraid of inconsistency". [214] Then Joseph Robertson, curator of the historical department at Register House, the national archives of Scotland, and a close friend of Forbes, wrote to Pusey on 27 February with news of another attempt at an out-of-court settlement. One of the bishops, (he did not disclose who), had written to him, asking if Forbes would repudiate transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and declare that his theological language was to be understood in terms of the seventeenth century divines. In return the Episcopal Synod would merely pass a sentence of exhortation against polemical discussion or dubious phraseology. There would also need to be some temporary arrangement made concerning Arbroath, and Forbes was also asked to distance himself from "Unionism". [215] Pusey forwarded the proposal to Forbes, commenting that it seemed a sort of "feeler" as to whether the bishops could pass a non-coercive sentence. Forbes' reply to the bishop has not been found, but he mentioned his response in a letter to William Bright (who had returned to Oxford in December 1859, where he became Professor of Ecclesiastical History in 1868). He told Bright he had determined to have no negotiation except with the college as a whole, because after his previous experience with the primus he did not want "another case of W[ordsworth] putting his foot through the negociation". The only solid basis for a negotiated settlement he would now accept would be "the Bishops

tolerating the *matter* of my teaching, with as much abuse of the *manner* as they think fit". As to Arbroath, Forbes said he "and my clergy would thankfully give over Mr Henderson". But Forbes was not sure what the repudiation of Unionism meant. If by it the bishop meant, "my strong sympathies for Corporate Reunion and my hatred of the Donatistic attitude of Anglicanism and the duty of all to minimize the differentiae of the three Churches" [Anglican, Roman and Orthodox], then he could not repudiate that. If, however, the bishop meant the *Union* newspaper's controntational attitude to Anglican Protestantism, what Forbes called "the waving the the red flag in the face of dear old foolish Protestant John Bull", then Forbes agreed he was against the *Union*. [216]

It was also during this adjournment that Forbes received the address of 5386 working men in Dundee. According to Mackay, his nineteenth century biographer, a deputation waited on Forbes on 28 February 1860, to give him the address which read:

> We, the undersigned operatives and work-people of Dundee, of all denominations, desire, at this particular time, to express our sincere respect for you, and our gratitude for all your numerous acts of kindness and charity to so many of our suffering brethren, while in sickness and distress, during the twelve years you have laboured among us. May God bless and reward you for such disinterested zeal for our and our childrens' welfare; and may your future exertions among us be still further rewarded, by the conscientious testimony and esteem of every class of the community.

To this address the leader of the deputation added:

> And I am respectfully requested to convey to your lordship, the sincere hope and desire of the parties subscribing the address, that you will be victorious over your adversaries, and that you will continue to pursue with increased vigour and success that Christian line of conduct of doing good to all, which you have hitherto so piously and devotedly pursued, nothwithstanding the calumnies of those who, for their own convenience, follow a different and a lukewarm course of conduct. [217]

The address, signed by men of various denominations, is a further indication, along with the infirmary admissions in Dundee, that Forbes was known to the working

class population in the city beyond those calling themselves Episcopalians. Such a widespread public demonstration of working class sympathy must have been an invaluable boost for Forbes. What other bishop, on either side of the border, could have boasted such working class support? It may have disappointed Forbes a little that it came because of his pastoral work, and not because these men understood or necessarily sympathised with his teaching. But it emphatically demonstrated to Episcopalians that the bishop was a figure whose work in Dundee was valued by large numbers of the industrial working men.

Forbes called his reception of this address one of the proudest moments of his life, especially because it came from working men. He claimed to have always had a special appreciation of the working class and believed there was a special divine benediction bestowed upon their condition because it was as one of them that Christ laboured for human salvation. He said the address would remind him of the need for continued work towards the alleviation of suffering.

> as long as sorrow & suffering are the conditions of our common manhood, so long is it our duty to do what we can for their alleviation, without any consideration beyond the thought of our one brotherhood in human nature. And the consideration that our sympathies are not to be bounded by any law short of that comprehensive one of universal benevolence commanded us by the precept & example of God himself. [218]

Meanwhile, Joseph Robertson had assured his correspondent that Forbes' friends would not stage any public humiliation of the bishops should Forbes' sentence be lenient. This, Robertson informed Forbes on 27 February 1860, had assisted those bishops counselling moderation, and the outcome now looked likely to be a censure and nothing more. However, he could not be certain of this as Wordsworth still desired Forbes' suspension and could yet prevail. Robertson also reported that Forbes' *Reply* to Henderson's *Pleadings* was "telling in more quarters

than one", which was not surprising as it was shorter and more succinct than his voluminous *Defence*. The working men's address was also having an "excellent effect", according to Robertson. [219] But Forbes continued to be anxious about succumbing to any temptation to moderate his teaching. [220] English Anglo-Catholic interest in the trial was now intense. The wealthy Anglo-Catholic member of Parliament, A.J.Beresford-Hope, was writing of Forbes' predicament in acerbic letters of support to the *Guardian*. W.Upton Richards, priest of All Saints, Margaret Street in London, wrote to Boyle asking for immediate notification when the verdict was delivered. [221]

When the trial resumed on 14 March, Bishop Ewing was absent because of illness. Keble had again come to Edinburgh to offer personal support. Forbes' *Reply* was held as read. In it he challenged Henderson's claim that the Thirty Nine Articles were the standard theological authority of the Episcopal Church. He argued that the presenters assumed their interpretation of the Articles was the only valid one whereas in fact they had been variously understood throughout Anglican history. "Once admit this fact", Forbes asserted, "and their argument is vitiated: for it becomes an absolute necessity to enquire, What is the *true* interpretation of the Articles?" [222] Forbes devoted his rejoinder to disproving that his teaching was contrary to the Articles. He said he had repeatedly acknowledged the all-suffiency of the cross as atonement, as per Article 31, and that the eucharist was not something distinct from that. He was misunderstood because while he used "sacrifice" in its passive sense, his opponents took him in the other, active, sense. Therefore they considered he was arguing for a repetition or completion of Calvary, but he was not. Forbes claimed Article 31 used "sacrifice" only in the active sense of "the *act* of offering", and he affirmed that this was indeed "finished" on the cross, but that its application (the passive sacrifice) went on in each generation of

believers through the eucharist. [223] Regarding Henderson's contention that the distinction between active and passive sacrifice was meaningless, Forbes asked if it followed that Christ's offering in heaven and on Calvary was also the same. Forbes categorically denied that in his charge he had advised his clergy gradually introduce Roman Catholic devotions, and said that his words on ritual were only directed at the "general beauty of ritual". [224] About reception of the eucharist by the unfaithful he claimed to be in accord with the correct interpretation of the relevant article.

> Article XXVIII. relates to the benefits which those who receive worthily obtain from the Lord's Supper. Therefore the word "receive" must, by force of the context, be there used of *beneficial* reception, whereas my words were "receive to their condemnation and loss", and had no bearing upon a statement in regard to those who receive the salvation of their souls. [225]

In the *Reply* Forbes became most personal when defending himself against the accusation that he had disparaged the Episcopal Church, which had evidently stung him. Forbes referred to the last two pages of his charge as an example of his veneration for the Church, which he said was habitual with him. He revealed something of his particular motivation in the controversy when he asked, "whether the tone and spirit of the Presenters is likely to foster any genuine reverence for the authority of the Church as a practical guide of belief and a check to modern individualism?" [226] This was the fundamental purpose for Forbes' own teaching and his motivation for his primary charge. He did not believe Henderson's theology was either exact enough, nor did it uphold a presence of Christ definite enough to claim the allegiance of the indifferent or disbelieving. Against the accusation that his diocese was disorganised by the controversy he pointed to an increase in confirmation and communion numbers during the past two years, and to his receiving expressions of sympathy from various congregations. [227] Again he asserted that his teaching was within the traditional toleration of the Anglican

Church, and said that as a bishop he did not enforce his teaching but acted in accordance with that tradition.

> The Anglican Church since the settlement of 1558 has confessedly and advisedly allowed a great diversity of statement upon the mystery [of the eucharist], and I as an individual Bishop should not be justified in breaking in upon that arrangement. Even though I did not take this view of a Bishop's duty, I have a great horror of invoking the coercive judgement of the Church, in behalf of a doctrine so intimately connected with the devotional life of faithful souls. [228]

Instead Forbes accused the presenters of disloyalty, by identifying their theology with what he called "the Puritan school of theology". If the bishops found for them they would not only be authorizing a theology antagonistic to the Church, but would also endorse a theological system that had been "unable to stem the rationalism of Germany and the impiety of Geneva". [229] If the trial had such an outcome, Forbes drew a picture of the Church losing the more zealous clergy, and being unable to recruit others of such quality, especially for the "towns containing such degraded populations". [230]

The trial then adjourned to the following day, 15 March 1860. That morning the bishops delivered their opinions in order of seniority. Terrot considered Forbes' language censurable as being *prima facie* inconsistent with the Articles. He found the presentment proved in regard to the first charge, but not the second, or the third where he considered Forbes' interpretation of Article 29 an acceptable one. Eden found likewise, but he particularly criticised Forbes' charge for giving the impression of *ex cathedra* teaching. Forbes' theory of presence could result in the Episcopal Church teaching the same "idolatry" as the medieval Church fell into. Wordsworth found Forbes guilty on all charges, and he condemned Forbes' theory of presence as a forsaken medieval one only renewed by Tract 90. Wordsworth as usual upheld virtualism as being the only authorized teaching of the Church on eucharistic presence. He asserted Forbes' teaching was not appropriate in a Church

that should be thankful for the blessings of the Reformation. Suther and Wilson merely confined themselves to agreement with these opinions. [231] The formal judgement and sentence followed. The bishops found the presentment "*relevant* and *Proven*" in regard to the first and second charges, in that Forbes' teaching was "*unsanctioned by* the Articles and Formularies of the Church and is to a certain extent inconsistent therewith". They found the third charge "not proven". The judgement continued:

> But in consideration of the explanations and modifications offered by the Respondent in his answers in reference to the first charge, and in consideration also that the Respondent now only asks for toleration for his opinions, and does not claim for them the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction - We the said College of Bishops feel that we shall best discharge our duty in this painful case by limiting our sentence to a Declaration of *Censure and Admonition*, and we do now solemnly admonish and in all brotherly love entreat the Bishop of Brechin to be more careful for the future, so that no further occasion may be given for trouble and offence such as has arisen from the delivery and publication of the Primary Charge to his clergy complained of in the Presentment. [232]

A copy of a letter from Bishop Ewing was entered into the record. Ewing stated he could not have agreed to any sentence which went beyond exhorting Forbes to abstain from "speculative teaching" on the eucharist. Even then, Ewing said, he remained dubious about any verdict against Forbes, because he felt the bishops bore some responsibility in encouraging such speculation in the Church. [233] Beresford-Hope sent Forbes a jubilant note on 16 March, "10,000 congratulations. Benedictus! soft words butter no parsnips, ergo, censures break no bones". [234] But Forbes confided in George Boyle that he felt "decidedly unstrung" in reaction to the end of the tension of the last months. His nerves were very shaken and, he said, he could find no comfort save in plunging into his parish work at Dundee. [235]

Unfortunately this was not the conclusion of Forbes' ordeal, because he now came under pressure from supporters dissatisfied with the judgement. William Bright, for instance, was worried about the bishops' statement that Forbes had modified his teaching and that he disclaimed the authority of the Church for it. He therefore wanted Forbes to do something to refute this immediately. Bright was particularly concerned that Forbes was being beaten to the public relations punch by Wordsworth, who had already had his trial opinion privately printed for distribution. [236] Bright's argument was reiterated by various writers in the *Union*, who were unhappy at the difference in the judgement passed on Forbes compared to that in the Cheyne case. A loosely coordinated campaign of correspondence to various publications was conducted by Forbes' friends, seeking to interpret the judgement favourably. Bright, Liddon, Beresford-Hope, Upton Richards, and others, all wrote or instigated such letters to the *Guardian* and the *Union*, or wherever they thought they could reach uncertain Anglo-Catholics. [237] Forbes himself was growing increasingly annoyed with some of his more zealous supporters, particularly the clergy of St. Ninian's, and the *Union*. [238]

In June, the trial judgement drew out one vehement public expression of support for Forbes. For some time he had received regular donations towards his work in Dundee from a Lieutenant Colonel Gordon of the 91st Regiment in India. On this occasion Gordon forwarded his donation publicly, with a letter to the *Guardian* (reprinted in the *Edinburgh Daily Courant*), in order, he told Forbes, to make his support known. The colonel wrote, militantly, that he sent his £50 in thanksgiving to God who had "been pleased to raise up a Bishop in Scotland to stand forth for the truth of Christ, and so to guide and rule the hearts of the Scottish Bishops his brethren, so that they in Synod assembled, have repudiated the Heresy of an Arbroath Vestry Room, and maintained the Catholic faith". Bishop

Terrot, who read the letter in the *Courant*, wrote to Forbes peevishly demanding he "do his duty" and repudiate the Colonel's interpretation of the trial. Forbes cordially declined, being, he said, in no way responsible for Colonel Gordon. [239]

Forbes began to prepare his address to the Brechin synod due in August 1860. He had kept silence about the judgement during these months because he believed his normal synod meeting was the most natural and least provocative way of expressing his opinion on the trial's outcome. But he was also certainly weary of controversy by now, and even wary of anything that could rekindle the fire of theological argument. However, he was determined that he should say something in public about what he thought were the ambiguities of the judgement. Keble also was anxious about the address reviving the controversy. But Pusey wrote to reassure him, and reported to Keble at the beginning of July that the bishop was, "less unstrung than he was; but thoroughly ill in body...and disappointed as to the small amount of faith in what we believe on the Holy Eucharist in the Scotch Church". [240] Forbes addressed his synod at its meeting on 1 August, and gave his explanation of the various expressions in the formal judgement that had been troubling some Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics, including Bright and Pusey. The words that worried them were those that said the bishop had made modifications in his teaching; that the word "now" (as in: "the respondent now only asks for toleration of his opinion, and does not claim for them the authority of the Church"), implied that he had shifted his ground; and the use of the word "opinions" to describe his teaching. Forbes told his clergy that his explanations subsequent to his primary charge were for the sake of clarity and precision, and emphatically were not modifications. Nor had he shifted his ground, he said, through fear of the consequences.

I maintain what I have taught, rightly understood, is in conformity with the

> Word of God, and with our own Formularies as interpreted by the light of the early Church; that is a part of the primitive deposit witnessed to by the liturgies and individual fathers of the earliest ages...I claim, then, the right to consider this doctrine as the expression of the true mind of the Church; but, inasmuch as in the Anglican Church there has always been allowed great latitude of belief on this most mysterious subject, I have not claimed the dogmatic sanction of the Church in the sense that she would require my statements to be believed as a term of communion. From this position I have never swerved. [241]

This, he felt, was not a claim for toleration as popularly understood, nor was it a disclaimer of the authority of the Church for his teaching, but only to the Church's "dogmatic sanction". "I claim the authority of the Church in the sense that the Church freely allows the teaching of what I have taught". As regards his teaching being referred to as his "opinions", he said he had more often used the word "belief". This, he considered, expressed his meaning that these doctrines were part of "the central truth" which the Church always held. Forbes then recommended prayer, the daily office, frequent communion, and retreats as a remedy to the relaxation of effort that often came after the intensity of controversy. Finally, he reminded them of the needs of the cities, and the necessity of unity among themselves if the Episcopal Church was to adequately provide urban mission.

> In the great towns it cannot be denied that there is growing up a generation much less under religious influences than the last, while the statistics of the rural districts exhibit to us a most deplorable picture of the morals of the peasantry. Whatever be the causes of this unhappy state of things, it is plain what our duty is...we must hold together...steady adherence to our principles, with a large minded regard for our brethren, cannot but be blessed by God. [242]

The synod also passed a motion petitioning the bishops to reconsider the restoration of Patrick Cheyne. Henderson was the sole dissenter. [243]

Forbes was still seeking a resolution to Henderson's refusal to have him confirm at Arbroath. He began to address the dispute again soon after the trial concluded, proceeding gently, he said, because of the illness of Henderson's wife. Forbes told Dean Ramsay, who had Henderson's ear, that he would not object to

another bishop acting this one time, provided Henderson acknowledged it to be a unique dispensation by Forbes. [244] Relations between Henderson and Forbes were further soured, if possible, by Forbes receiving an address from eighteen members of the Arbroath congregation, expressing their "unabated affection, respect, and esteem", and desiring him to come to Arbroath. [245] Henderson's opposition had also been reinforced by Forbes' synod address, which the priest regarded as an expression of contumacy against the verdict of the bishops. Relations between the two men remained estranged, and the confirmation at Arbroath at an impasse, for the rest of the year. But Forbes' problems with the other divided congregation, at Brechin, resolved themselves in October 1861, when Dean Moir resigned to accept the charge of the congregation at Jedburgh. [246]

After his synod Forbes took up his clergy's petition concerning Patrick Cheyne, as a mandate to pursue a resolution to the old priest's situation. Prior to the normal meeting of the Episcopal Synod in October 1860 he made a proposal to Cheyne suggesting a fresh explanation of his teaching. Cheyne found this unacceptable as it involved changing his theological terms, as well as explaining his condemned sermons by accepting Forbes' explanations on adoration and sacrifice. [247] Forbes regretted this refusal as it made it difficult for him to support the Brechin resolution at the Episcopal Synod with anything new. [248] His fears about the outcome of his diocese's petition proved correct. At the synod meeting on 4 October the bishops stuck to the letter of the canon, and replied that it was up to Cheyne to seek restoration and until that happened they could not act. [249] There was one last gasp of the eucharistic controversy at this synod. The bishops received memorials from Sir Thomas Gladstone, another prominent layman, and also from laymen at Brechin, objecting to Forbes' recent synod address and to the clergy's motion of support for it. These, they said, were a repudiation of the trial verdict

by an adherence to a censured doctrine. They petitioned the bishops not to let this go unnoticed. [250] But the bishops contented themselves with an acknowledgement, declining to take the matter further as being beyond their immediate jurisdiction. [251]

By the end of 1860 Keble was particularly worried about Forbes' distress over the lack of belief among Episcopalians in the teaching he had propounded, which teaching Forbes sincerely believed to be fundamental to Catholic belief. Pusey, as he had with Newman prior to 1845, was less ready or able to see signs of real doubt and uncertainty. He told Keble on 4 December 1860 that he thought Forbes' distress was no more acute than it had been. Pusey thought Forbes had been too optimistic about the level of acceptance among Episcopalians of the doctrines he espoused, and was now having to make a painful readjustment. [252] But in this instance Keble knew better. At some time in early December he had received a letter from Forbes which revealed the bishop's difficulties were serious. Forbes had told Keble:

> One cannot but feel that the beautiful school of thought following from 1833 has done its work and exists but as a phase of mind in the Church. It can in no sense be said to represent Anglicanism. That the world should oppose it and allow it to exist as a merely tolerated School of Opinion, I lay no store by, but religiously it seems to have dried up; both stronger and more sentimental minds seem to have passed through it in different directions, and it has failed to touch the more pious souls among the Evangelicals and Weslyans. [253]

Pusey put the whole thing down to neuralgia. But Keble was convinced there was doubt of real substance in Forbes' mind about the claims the Oxford Movement made for the Anglican Church as a part of the Catholic Church, doubt caused by the failure of his teaching to convince many people. The events of the next decade would prove Keble read his friend's mind more accurately.

The most notable consequence of Forbes' Tractarian teaching in his primary charge of 1857 was the way in which it caused further division within the Episcopal Church. The Church was already broadly split into the northern area sympathetic to native nonjuring traditions; and the southern portion more influenced by the Church of England. But the divisions over Forbes' charge cut across this existing divergence. Opposition to Forbes' Oxford Movement doctrine prevailed in both areas. The majority of the northern clergy were content with their traditional virtualist theology on the eucharist, and others were unhappy with Forbes' criticism of the Nonjurors. A small number of the northern clergy were sympathetic to the Tractarians, but these were mainly confined to Forbes' diocese, or to a few zealous English Anglo-Catholics. Predominant among the southern clergy and influential laity, who were predominantly English High Churchmen or anglicized Scots, was a desire for conformity with the Church of England. These southern Churchmen, along with a small number of northern clergy, were unhappy with any sign of nonconformity with the Church of England, such as Forbes' Tractarianism. What did concern all the opposition was the apparent sympathy towards Roman Catholicism among Tractarians, and specifically, the similarity of Forbes' teaching to Roman Catholic doctrine. This gave Forbes' opponents the correct impression that he was antipathetic to the Protestant heritage of their Church, and further alienated their sympathies.

At the end of the eucharistic controversy in 1860 neither Forbes' supporters nor his opponents were predominant in the Episcopal Church. Forbes was not entirely acquitted nor effectively condemned. However the dispute had left the northerners more divided than the south. Ability to resolve the dispute had not been assisted by the vacuum of authority within the Episcopal Church, and the inadequacy of the present structures was becoming increasingly apparent, as the

memorial of the fifty one clergy to the Episcopal Synod in May 1858 illustrated. But the controversy, and more especially the trial itself, gained widespread publicity for Tractarian teaching, and for Forbes himself. It was extensively reported in many of the leading Scottish newspapers, including the *Scotsman*. This made Forbes the most well-known Episcopalian figure of the period. Respect for his ministry in Dundee probably gained his teaching a more sympathetic hearing, although the continued opposition to it from Sir John Ogilvie is a warning against pressing this point. The eucharistic controversy was a catalyst in making the Scottish Episcopal Church a more theologically tolerant Church. Previously it had espoused a High Church theology, and was uniformly opposed to Evangelicalism and Roman Catholicism. Forbes had claimed toleration for Tractarian teaching which many Episcopalians, if not most, regarded as foreign to their Church and too similar to Roman Catholicism. Yet the survival of that claim - the failure of the trial to effectively condemn Forbes, or to silence him when he later reiterated the sanction of the Church for what he taught - left Tractarianism free to be propagated by Episcopalian sympathisers. However, in doing so, Tractarians and the younger Anglo-Catholics could not have known that their Scottish leader was beginning something of a crisis of confidence. Evidence for the strain the three years of division and acrimony caused to Forbes himself is scanty during the period of the controversy itself. Much of what does exist is found in the correspondence between Pusey and Keble, and most of this belongs to their letters written during the 1860's. Therefore, the story of Forbes' increasing unhappiness and disillusionment with the Episcopal Church, and his growing attraction towards Roman Catholicism will be told in the following chapter. The evidence for this shift away from Forbes' previous confidence in the catholicity of his Church may well have been one of the reasons for his destruction of most of his personal papers, mentioned by Perry. [254] While the eucharistic controversy among Scottish Episcopalians provided

Tractarianism with a public platform in Scotland, its adherents there could not have known that the failure of its immediate success had undermined Forbes' confidence in the Oxford Movement and the Anglican Church, and exacerbated his previous unhappiness with the Episcopal Church's smallness and divisions.

NOTES.

1. A.P.Forbes, *A Primary Charge*, (1857), 6-7.
2. Ibid., 7-11.
3. Ibid., 12.
4. Ibid., 23.
5. Ibid., 12f.
6. Ibid., 26-29.
7. Ibid., 30.
8. Ibid., 31.
9. Ibid., 32-4.
10. Ibid., 35.
11. Ibid., 38.
12. Ibid., 39-42.
13. Ibid., 43.
14. Ibid., 44.
15. Ibid., 46.
16. Ibid., 48.
17. Perry, 76.
18. DNB *First Supplement*, (1901), vol.ii, 128.
19. Forbes, Op.Cit., 13.
20. REC.II., 25 September 1856, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 323.
21. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 12 July 1859, BrMS.1.1.158.
22. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 12 October 1859, BrMS.1.1.203.
23. Forbes to G.Forbes, 27 October 1856, BrMS.1.5.2.
24. A.Hardelin, *Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*, (1965), 165f.
25. Forbes, Op.Cit., 45.
26. See p.143.
27. B.Reardon, *From Coleridge to Gore*, (1971), 252.
28. W.Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, (1957), 21.
29. Perry, 84.
30. R.Eden to C.H.Terrot, "Ss.Simon & Jude"[28 October], BrMs.1.5.3.
31. REC.II., 11 December 1857, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 335.
32. Ibid., 11 December 1857, 335-6.
33. William Walker, *Three Churchmen*, (1893), 95-6.
34. Ibid., 106.
35. Ibid., 120.
36. Ibid., 125.
37. SEJ., January 1858, 17-18.
38. Hardelin, *Tractarian Understanding*, 128.
39. Walker, Op.Cit., 126.
40. 3&4Victoria, Cap.xxxiii.
41. Unlisted papers: Bp. Terrot's report on the 1857 deputation to London in regard to the legal disbilities, dated 24 July 1857, in Scottish Record Office, to be added to CH.12.
42. Ibid.
43. M.Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*, (1966), 161.
44. J.Tulloch, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century*, (1885, repr.1971), 324.
45. SEJ., January 1858, 18.
46. R.Eden to C.H.Terrot, "Ss.Simon & Jude"[28 October]1857, BrMs.1.5.3.
47. SEJ., January 1858, 18.
48. SEJ., January 1860, 13-18.

49. SEJ., February 1858, 36.
50. J.Ogilvie to A.P.Forbes, 24 February 1860, BrMS.1.2.369.
51. SEJ., February 1858, 36.
52. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 11 February 1858, BrMS.1.1.2(i).
53. J.Keble, *On Eucharistical Adoration*, (1857), 172.
54. A.P.Forbes to W.Gladstone, 14 February 1858, BL.44154, f.220.
55. A.P.Forbes to G.Boyle, 16 January 1858, BrMs.1.5.14.
56. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d.[19 February 1858], PH., PK.v
57. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, 25 February[1858], PH., PPCUP 5.40.
58. W.Trower to E.B.Pusey, 26 February[1858], PH., PK.v.
59. Forbes, *Primary Charge*, 12.
60. Ibid., 6.
61. Ibid., 7.
62. R.Johnson, "A Short History of St. Columba's Episcopal Church 1843-1969", (Typed booklet, 1977), SRO., CH.12.5.81, 12.
63. J.Alexander to W.Brand, 24 February 1858, SRO., CH.12.5.74.
64. W.Bright to G.F.Boyle, postmarked 27 February 1858, BrMs.1.5.15.
65. SEJ., March 1858, 50.
66. SEJ., May 1858, Supplement, 1-2.
67. Ibid., 2-4.
68. *Documents relative to the Proceedings of the Special Meeting of the College of Bishops held at Edinburgh on May 27 1858,* (1858).
69. SEJ., May 1858, Supplement, 5.
70. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 29 May 1858, PH., PK.v.
71. PH., BHT. Minutes, November 1856-June 1859, 103.
72. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, 17 June 1858, BrMs.1.5.36.
73. J.B.Primrose, "The Pitsligo Press of George Hay Forbes", in *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions*, (1962), vol.iv, 56.
74. See my article "George Forbes" in DNB *Supplementary Volume - From Beginnings to 1985*, (ed. C.S.Nicholls), publication pending.
75. George Hay Forbes, "Eucharistical Adoration", in *The Panoply*, vol.ii, (n.d.), 264-5.
76. C.Wordsworth to G.H.Forbes, 31 July 1858, SAUL.19.2.192.
77. C.Wordsworth to G.H.Forbes, 5 October 1858, SAUL.19.2.198; & 15 November [1858], SAUL.19.2.201.
78. H.Forbes to W.Brand, n.d., SRO., CH.12.5.45.
79. H.Forbes to G.Forbes, n.d. & incomplete, SAUL.19.2.205.
80. C.Wordsworth to G.H.Forbes, 15 November [1858], SAUL.19.2.201.
81. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, BrMs.4.1.3., 53-62.
82. *Opinion of the Bishop of Brechin, in the appeal of the Rev. P. Cheyne, against the sentence of the Bishop of Aberdeen.* (1858), 3.
83. Gibb N. Pennie, "The Trial of the Rev. Patrick Cheyne for Erroneous Teaching on the Eucharist in Aberdeen in 1858" in RSCHS, vol.xxiii, (1987), 77-93.
84. *Opinion of the Bishop of Brechin*, Op.Cit., 1-2.
85. REC.II., 30 September-1 October 1858, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 361-377.
86. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 22 February [1858], Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.230.
87. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 29 August 1858, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.226.
88. Presentment, BrMS.1.1.198.
89. REC.II., 4 November 1858, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 383-4.
90. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, "Sat"[November]1858, PH., PK.v.

91. J.Moir to A.P.Forbes, 19 November 1858, BrMS.1.1.13(i).
92. D.Sandford to A.P.Forbes, 18 November 1858, BrMS.1.1.12.
93. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, 19 November 1858, BrMS.1.5.51.
94. SEJ., vol.viii, (1858), 198-9.
95. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, December 1858, PH., PK.v.
96. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.1.82.
97. W.Bright to A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.1.38.
98. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.1.31. & A.F.Irvine, 8 December 1858, BrMS.1.1.35.
99. C.Wordsworth to A.P.Forbes, "St. Thomas' Day"[21 December], BrMS.1.1.49.
100. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, "Eve of Epiphany"[5 January]1859, PH., KP.iv.
101. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, 6 January 1859, BrMS.1.6.60(ii).
102. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, 6 January[1859], BrMS.1.1.63.
103. H.Humble to A.P.Forbes, 7 January 1859, BrMS.1.1.65.
104. C.Wordsworth to A.P.Forbes, 8 January 1859, BrMS.1.1.66.
105. A.P.Forbes to C.Wordsworth, n.d., BrMS.1.1.67.
106. C.Wordsworth, *Notes toward forming a Right Judgement on the Eucharistic Controversy*, (1858), 51.
107. Ibid., 54.
108. Ibid., 57-9.
109. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, postmarked 13 January 1859, BrMS.1.6.62.
110. A.P.Forbes to J.S.Forbes, n.d.[c.27 February 1859], BrMS.1.1.98.
111. Excerpts from the minutes of the Laurencekirk Meeting, notes in the hand of George Boyle, BrMS.1.8.166(ii).
112. J.Moir to A.P.Forbes, 21 January 1859, BrMS.1.1.75.
113. R.S.Hunt to A.P.Forbes, 7 February 1859, BrMS.1.1.86.
114. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, postmarked 11 February 1859, BrMS.1.6.65.
115. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, 17 February[1859], BrMS.1.1.96.
116. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, "Wedn. morning"[February 1859], BrMS.1.1.99.
117. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, 17 February [1859], BrMS.1.1.96.
118. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 25 February 1859, BrMS.1.1.97.
119. REC.II., 4 October 1859, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 297.
120. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, 17 February[1859], BrMS.1.1.96.
121. A.P.Forbes to W.S.Wilson, 26 March 1859, BrMS.1.1.111.
122. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 8 April 1859, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.234.
123. W.E.Gladstone to A.P.Forbes, 9 April 1859, BrMS.1.1.125.
124. H.S.Howard to J.Moir, 8 July 1859, BrMS.1.1.155.
125. J.Moir to A.P.Forbes, 16 July 1859, BrMS.1.1.161.
126. J.Moir to A.P.Forbes, 15 June 1859, BrMS.1.1.147.
127. SEJ., October 1859, 66; & George Foxton to A.P.Forbes, 14 October 1859, BrMS.1.1.207.
128. A.P.Forbes to T.Suther, draft letter n.d., BrMS 1.1.114.
129. E.B.Ramsay to A.P.Forbes, 11 May 1859, BrMS.1.1.142.
130. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, postmarked 1 August 1859, BrMS.1.6.75.
131. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, 7 June 1859, BrMS. 1.1.145.
132. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d.[prior to 8 April 1859], BrMS.1.1.108.
133. G.H.Forbes to A.P.Forbes, 3 August 1859, BrMs.1.1.178.
134. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Ramsay, 3 August 1859, BrMS.1.1.177.
135. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 3 August 1859, BrMS.4.1.3., 68.
136. Ibid., 69-78.
137. C.H.Terrot to A.P.Forbes, 27 August[1859], BrMS 1.1.183.
138. REC.II., 6 October 1859, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 405-9.

139. A.P.Forbes to C.H.Terrot, n.d., BrMS.1.1.184.
140. REC.II., 6 October 1859, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 409-10.
141. SEJ., October 1859, 174.
142. G.Grub to A.P.Forbes, 11 October 1859, BrMS.1.1.200.
143. W.Walker, *Three Churchmen*, (1893), 269.
144. A.P.Forbes to G.Grub, n.d., BrMS.1.1.202.
145. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.2.313.
146. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.2.314.
147. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 11 October[1859], PH., PK.v.
148. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 12 October 1859, BrMS.1.1.203.
149. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, [October]1859, PH., PK.v.
150. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 13 October 1859, PH., PK.v.
151. E.B.Pusey to G.F.Boyle, 24 October[1859], BrMS.1.6.88.
152. C.H.Terrot to A.Forbes Irvine, n.d., BrMS.1.1.213.
153. A.Forbes Irvine to A.P.Forbes, 18 October 1859, BrMS.1.1.212.
154. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 23 October 1859, PH., KP.iv.
155. E.B.Pusey to G.F.Boyle, 24 October[1859], BrMS.1.6.88.
156. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, postmarked 25 October 1859, BrMS.1.6.89.
157. A.P.Forbes to A.Forbes Irvine, n.d.[October 1859], BrMS.1.1.214.
158. A.P.Forbes to A.Forbes Irvine, draft reply n.d., BrMS.1.1.215.
159. A.P.Forbes, *Letter to the Congregation of S.Paul's Dundee*, (1859).
160. *The Ecclesiastic and Theologian*, vol.xxi, (1859), 584-9.
161. Ibid, vol.xxii, (1860), 48.
162. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 12 November 1859, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.246.
163. SEJ., November 1859, 191-199.
164. A.Forbes Irvine to A.P.Forbes, 15 November 1859, BrMS.1.1.257.
165. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, 17 November[1859], BrMS.1.1.258.
166. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.v.
167. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 18 November 1859, PH., KP.iv.
168. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 21 November 1859, BrMS.1.1.260.
169. A.P.Forbes to A.Forbes Irvine, 23 November 1859, BrMS.1.1.262.
170. A.Forbes Irvine to A.P.Forbes, 28 November 1859, BrMS.1.1.266.
171. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 21 December 1859, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.264.
172. A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.2.302.
173. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 26 December 1859, BrMS.1.2.298.
174. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, "Xmas Eve"[24 December]1859, BrMS.1.2.295.
175. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, "St. Stephen's Day"[26 December]1859, BrMS.1.2.298.
176. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 27 December[1859], Gladstone Papers, BL. 44154, f.268.
177. C.H.Terrot to A.P.Forbes, 30 December[1859], BrMS.1.2.304.
178. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 31 December[1859], Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.270.
179. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, 31 December 1859, BrMS.1.6.99(ii).
180. W.Bright to G.F.Boyle, 23 January 1860, BrMS.1.7.108.
181. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, "New Years Eve"[1 January]1859, PH., KP.iv.
182. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.2.311.
183. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 4 January 1860, PH., PK.v.
184. A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.2.334.
185. W.S.Wilson to A.P.Forbes, 9 January 1860, BrMS.1.2.332.
186. A.P.Forbes, *Theological Defence*, (1860), 14.
187. Ibid., 75-80.

188. Ibid., 74.
189. Ibid., 91.
190. Ibid., 112.
191. Ibid., 211.
192. Ibid., 230.
193. Ibid., 230.
194. Ibid., 233-4.
195. A.P.Forbes to C.Wordsworth, draft letter n.d., BrMS.1.2.340.
196. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d., PH., PK.v.
197. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 4S after Epiphany, BrMS.1.4.820.
198. Perry, 97.
199. David Smith & Patrick Wilson to W. Wilson, 6 February 1860, "Documents in the Appeals of Aitchison...Cheyne...Smith & in the Presentment Henderson and Others v Bishop of Brechin", SRO., CH.12.60.10(iv).
200. REC.II., 7 February 1860, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 435-440.
201. Ibid., 440-445.
202. W.Henderson, *Pleadings in the Case Henderson and Others v. the Bishop of Brechin*, (1860), 4.
203. Ibid., 4-5.
204. Ibid., 18.
205. Ibid., 43.
206. Ibid., 46.
207. Ibid., 59.
208. Ibid., 60.
209. Ibid., 63-4.
210. Ibid., 72.
211. Ibid., 88.
212. REC.II., 9 February 1860, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 445-7.
213. G.F.Boyle to E.B.Pusey, "Eve of S.Mathias"[23 February]1860, PH., PK.v.
214. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.v.
215. J.Robertson to E.B.Pusey, 27 February 1860, PH., PK.v.
216. A.P.Forbes to W.Bright, n.d., PH., PK.v.
217. Mackey, 116.
218. A.P.Forbes, n.d., BrMS.1.2.388.
219. J.Robertson to A.P.Forbes, 7 March 1860, BrMS.1.2.389.
220. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 8 March[1860], PH., PK.v.
221. W.U.Richards to G.F.Boyle, 10 March 1860, BrMS.1.7.109.
222. A.P.Forbes, *Reply to the Pleadings*, (1860), 8-9.
223. Ibid., 18.
224. Ibid., 32-3.
225. Ibid., 37.
226. Ibid., 38.
227. Ibid., 42.
228. Ibid., 43.
229. Ibid., 45.
230. Ibid., 46.
231. SEJ., March 1860, 52-55.
232. REC.II., 15 March 1860, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 449-450.
233. Ibid., 450-1.
234. A.J.Beresford-Hope to A.P.Forbes, 16 March 1860, BrMS.1.7.109(vii).
235. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle, 28 March[1860], BrMS.1.7.110.
236. W.Bright to A.P.Forbes, "St. Cuthbert's Day"[20 March 1860], BrMS.1.2.398; 18 April[1860], BrMS.1.2.415; 19 April[1860], BrMS.1.2.416.

237. W.Bright to A.P.Forbes, 18 April[1860], BrMS.1.2.415. & W.U.Richards to A.P.Forbes, 23 April[1860], BrMS.1.2.419.
238. A.P.Forbes to G.F.Boyle: "Easter Day"[8 April]1860, BrMS.1.7.111; & postmarked 21 July 1860, BrMS.1.7.117.
239. C.H.Terrot to A.P.Forbes, 16 June[1860], BrMS.1.2.431; & A.P.Forbes to C.H.Terrot, n.d., BrMS.1.2.422.
240. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 1 July 1860, PH., PK.v.
241. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 1 August 1860, BrMS.4.1.3., 81.
242. Ibid., 83.
243. Ibid., 83-4.
244. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Ramsay, n.d., BrMS.1.2.409.
245. BrMS.1.2.441.
246. J.Moir to A.P.Forbes, "St. Simon & Jude's Day"[28 October]1861, BrMS.1.3.540.
247. P.Cheyne to F.G.Lee, 12 September 1860, BrMS.1.2.462.
248. A.P.Forbes to G.Grub, 24 September 1860, BrMS.1.2.470.
249. REC.III., 4 October 1860, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 12-13.
250. SRO., CH.12.12.2204-7.
251. REC.III., 4 October 1860, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 15-20.
252. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, postmarked 4 December 1860, PH., PK.v.
253. A.P.Forbes to J.Keble, n.d.[Advent 1860], PH., PK.v.
254. Perry, ix.

5

NEW THINGS FOR OLD.

In the manner of many mentors schooled at Oxford, Forbes was taking a country walk one day with a young man to talk about the youth's intellectual perplexities. The young man was worried about some of the new scientific theories and thought it possible God had abandoned the universe to run according to its own mechanical laws. Forbes touched a blade of grass with his foot and said, "I believe that God takes as much individual care of that blade of grass, as if nothing else existed in the universe, and that he does not abandon it to the independent action of any laws whatsoever". [1] It is not known when this small incident took place, but it could well represent the conflicts Forbes experienced during the 1860's. The younger man was apparently troubled by the new theories of empirical science, and in reply Forbes asserted the traditional doctrine of providence that God was intimately responsible for the existence and growth of all life, no matter how insignificant. Faced with challenges to orthodox Christian belief Forbes' usual response was to assert traditional answers. During the first years of the 1860's he came into contact with some of the most important of these new theories in the shape of biblical and historical criticism, and later, empirical science. He also had to come to grips with the growing force of anglicization in the Episcopal Church, which reached a climax in this decade. Forbes' answer to all three was to uphold tradition, but with varying degrees of flexibility.

Sometime during 1860, possibly in August, Forbes was informed about the publication of *Essays and Reviews* by William Bright, at Oxford. *Essays and Reviews* was a composite volume of seven essays by Broad Churchmen attempting to address the implications of unrestricted theological enquiry for scripture and Christian belief. The essayists' use of biblical criticism was cautious compared to that in Germany, but for most British Churchmen it was their first introduction to higher criticism. Consequently, the book initiated one of the fiercest religious controversies in Victorian Britain. The reaction of the Church of England undermined the Broad Church movement and precipitated a second rise of high church influence. The essayists were not linked by any formal theological agreement, and the unplanned and uncoordinated nature of the book was the source of its troubles. Its lack of an editorial policy made the theological position vague, and haste in assembling the essays also led their writers to unconsidered statements they later regretted or wished to modify. It was published on 21 March 1860 and despite significant differences between the contributors there was a basic theological presupposition that religious belief should be defended by an appeal to morality, rather than to doctrine. The contributors argued for a spiritual religion that did not derive authority from external evidences - a supposed apostolic clarity in understanding revelation, a literal veracity of scripture, or dogma. Christianity was important as a moral religion and an ethical force rather than as the revelation of supernatural truth. The Church was regarded as the religious expression of the community and this required it to be widely comprehensive. While the essayists saw doctrine as historically conditioned they did not understand the same thing of morality, enshrining the values of Victorian England as timeless truth. But the greatest weakness in the book was that there was no mention of Christology. They revered the historical Jesus as a moral teacher but appealed more fundamentally to the philosophical abstractions of natural theology. [2]

According to the essays' historian, the most provocative and influential review of the book was that of the Unitarian Frederic Harrison in the *Westminster Review* who argued that the essays were a united work, timidly standing between orthodoxy and honest agnosticism, whose writers really espoused the latter position. [3] This common viewpoint was reinforced for many orthodox Churchmen, (who generally did not read the liberal *Westminster Review*), by Samuel Wilberforce's anonymous review in the *Quarterly Review*, which largely followed Harrison's analysis. Following the appearance of these reviews the book generated enormous controversy. By the end of 1861 *Essays and Reviews* had gone through ten editions, and by 1865 some four hundred books, pamphlets and articles had been written on it. [4] The overwhelming proportion of these varied publications came from Churchmen fiercely upholding orthodoxy against the essayists. While the reaction of orthodox Churchmen reveals the intellectual isolation of British Churchmen from their counterparts among German Protestants, the opposition of Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics demonstrated the influence of Pusey. Forbes had commented to his brother George, "it will be very sad if we have to go through such a course as the Lutherans in Germany have had to endure". [5] This remark about the harm Forbes believed had been done to German Lutheranism by the rationalism of higher criticism was most likely coloured by Pusey's well-known reaction to his earlier acceptance of biblical criticism. By 1840 Pusey had become a scriptural literalist because of his fear that rational criticism threatened acceptance of scripture and the doctrine of the Church as divine revelation.

Bright had told Forbes of the evil the work was doing in a rationalist direction, and Forbes thought the essays needed to be answered. George suggested Alexander write something on the subject because the bishop had "much influence with the ultras" and it would "re-unite you with `others´ by the feeling we were all

struggling against a common danger". As a northern Churchman, George saw possibilities in the controversy over *Essays and Reviews* for Alexander to restore his standing among northern Episcopalians which had been damaged during the eucharistic controversy. His brother thought Forbes could also help effect a reconciliation between Tractarian "ultras" and northern Episcopalians, who had been divided over Forbes eucharistic teaching, by uniting them against the biblical criticism that both parties perceived as a threat to orthodox belief. [6]

By November 1860 Forbes, who had been staying at Oxford, wrote to his brother lamenting the predominance of the "Jowett party" at the university. [7] Benjamin Jowett, Regius Professor of Greek, had contributed one of the most controversial essays in *Essays and Reviews* - "On the Interpretation of Scripture". Jowett made it one of his life's aims to remould the university into a liberal academic institution, influenced by religion but free from the restrictions of confessional tests. Forbes evidently considered Jowett the leading figure among the liberals in the university, although his description of them as a party was too cohesive a term for such individualistic men.

Forbes did not take up his brother's suggestion to write something against the *Essays and Reviews*, nor he did respond to another proposal from Walter Trower, who wrote to Forbes in December asking support for a motion to the Oxford University Convocation repudiating the principles of the book. Trower was especially anxious for Forbes' support because Forbes was both a bishop and an Oxford man. [8] His approach seems to bear out George Forbes' idea that opposition to the liberals could unite the Episcopalian parties previously divided over the eucharistic controversy. Even the formerly antagonistic Trower apparently thought he could count on Forbes' support against a common foe, despite their past antipathies.

Forbes, although anxious about what he called "the evils of Rationalism in the English Church", had read only one of the essays (Mark Pattison's), but that was sufficient for him to appreciate "their very unsettling tendency". [9] Pattison's essay discussed the development of eighteenth-century evidential theology, and applied the principle of development to show "there is a law of continuity in the progress of theology". [10] By this he meant that the anti-rationalism of the Tractarians was an historical reaction against eighteenth-century rationalism and not a traditional Catholic trait. His essay was a plea for critical historical scholarship in theology. No wonder Forbes, who had reacted so strongly to propositions of development in theology in his primary charge, thought Pattison's essay a disturbing example of rationalism. However, Forbes hesitated to give his consent to Trower's resolution because he did not want to give liberal theology in England further assistance by way of persecution. He alluded to the Tractarian campaign against the liberal R.D.Hampden at Oxford which had invested him with the character of a martyr. It was only Hampden's appointment as Bishop of Hereford which had, according to Forbes, divested him of that mantle and thereby "prevented the formation of a dangerous school as early as the date of his appointment". Nor did Forbes think that any expression of what he called "the country-parson mind", or mere reaction, would carry any weight with the government of Lord Palmerston. As Forbes told Bishop Robert Eden of Moray in February 1862, when defending his decision not to support Trower's proposed resolution:

> In my present state of feeling I am inclined to think that an intellectual error has to be met intellectually, and I shd be glad to see the Reviews & Essays[sic] crushed by a series of able replies - care however must be taken lest the Defence of the Truth be committed to such feeble men as Burgon & Gresley...Distressing as it is that the rising intellect of the country should be thus perverted, I cannot believe that the evil will be a lasting one. I do not expect that those negations of truth will ever take a strong hold on the English mind...and so when the fashion of the moment is passed, [they will] lead to a blessed reaction. [11]

But Forbes' failure to take up the challenge of *Essays and Reviews* more directly may well have been due to the fact that his energies were occupied closer to home with a threat to the Scottish Communion Office. At the annual Episcopal Synod on 3 October 1861 the bishops considered a remit from the Diocese of Moray and Ross asking them to take appropriate steps to secure the removal of the clerical disabilities. Bishop Eden made a lengthy statement on "certain measures" which he, in conjunction with Alexander Ewing, had taken regarding the disabilities when they had recently been in London. The content of this statement is not reported in the minutes but it led to the bishops agreeing that a paper should be prepared "as soon as possible" by Eden. After revision by each of the Scottish bishops it was to be sent to the English bishops. [12] At an episcopal conference held in Edinburgh on 18 December 1861 it was decided to authorize a committee to consider measures expedient to the removal of the disabilities by Parliament. [13]

The bishops' concern for the removal of those legal disabilities which prevented Episcopalian clergy being beneficed in the Church of England had previously caused Forbes some anxiety, because the *quid pro quo* for their removal looked like being the abolition of the Scottish Communion Office. In March 1857 he had considered the possibility that General Synod might change canon 21 which gave the Office primary authority in the Church. If this happened Forbes asked his brother George if he could see any alternative to either submission or resignation. [14] His anxiety at that time had been caused by the desire of Bishop Ewing to get rid of the Office, and an anticipation of a strong move by the southern clergy to abolish it. He told his brother at the time that he suspected that while the northern clergy would deplore such a move, "they will not take upon themselves the responsibility of a Schism" which their opposition could well compel them into.

[15] Evidently, Forbes was aware of the strength of feeling against the Office in the more anglicized south, and was concerned that northern opposition would not be determined enough to prevent the Office's demise at a future General Synod. Therefore, at the Episcopal Synod in November 1859 he had moved an amendment against calling a General Synod at that time, which was lost in favour of one establishing a committee to report on the possible revision of the Code of Canons. [16]

Forbes' anxieties over the continued place of the Scottish Office in the Episcopal Church were compounded by his personal reaction to the recent eucharistic controversy. In May 1861 Forbes was again writing in what Keble called his "old melancholy strain". [17] Pusey attributed Forbes' depression to his being "utterly broken by the Scotch trial". Reiterating his earlier conclusion that Forbes had been more optimistic than the two of them about Episcopalian belief in the real objective presence, Pusey believed he was suffering a profound disillusionment. Pusey also told Keble, ominously, that contributing to Forbes' difficulties was his "original bias, that the first deep impressions of religion in Bp. F's life of manhood came through R.C.'s". [18] Pusey's comment, from one who knew Forbes intimately, indicates that Forbes' disenchantment with the Episcopal Church had grown to such an extent that he was beginning to consider the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. Pusey's reference to religion must surely have meant Catholic religion, but he did not elaborate on this, as it must have been well-known to himself and Keble as Forbes' spiritual advisors. Nevertheless this early contact with Roman Catholics evidently made a sufficiently strong impression on Forbes for Pusey to call it Forbes' "original bias". As mentioned above this impressionable encounter was probably made in India where personal contact across the Churches was more possible than in Britain.

Forbes responded cautiously to Eden's paper about the disabilities. He considered there was no chance of the Episcopal Church winning parliamentary revocation of them under Palmerston's government, nor while the Evangelicals were politically so influential. Forbes was no doubt aware, through his connection with Gladstone, that since Lord Palmerston's ministry had come to power in 1855 Palmerston had turned to Lord Shaftesbury for advice on Church appointments. While Shaftesbury endeavoured to recognise merit wherever he found it, inevitably, as a convinced Evangelical, he favoured men of his own party. This influence resulted in other Evangelicals joining John Bird Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his brother on the English bench, so that for the first time Evangelicals constituted a majority among the English bishops. By the time Palmerston died in 1865 nineteen English bishops were Evangelicals. [19] Those Evangelicals nominated early in Palmerston's ministry, (before 1859), were more extreme because Shaftesbury did not expect the ministry to last and was concerned to have godly men elevated while he still retained some influence. The secession of John Newman and other Anglicans to Rome after 1845 had increased Evangelical suspicion of the whole High Church party. This did not necessarily mean all Evangelical bishops were equally opposed to the high Scottish Episcopal Church. But to someone like Forbes, who had closely followed the prosecution of George Denison which had been backed by the Evangelical Alliance, the connection between Evangelicals and opposition to High Churchmen was established well before 1861. But he thought no harm could come from maintaining the lobbying on the issue, although he did not think relinquishing the Scottish Office would ameliorate Evangelical opposition. "I am glad", he wrote in a draft letter (words he later crossed out), "to see that there is no intention of bartering the Office for the Disabilities. I do not believe that even if the Office was given up, the Evangelical opposition would be withdrawn." [20]

On 7 February 1862 Bishop Terrot forwarded to the bishops a letter he had received from Archbishop Sumner concerning the support of the English bench for parliamentary abolition of the disabilities. Sumner had written that a number of the English bishops had discussed the subject and had directed him to ask, "whether in your opinion the Consecra[tion] Service which differs from that of the English Church would be authoritatively set aside by your episcopal brethren there having been a general opinion that if that were done a great obstacle would be removed which now stands in the way of the measure you desire". [21] Sumner's letter made plain to the Scottish bishops that abolition of the Scottish Office was the price to be paid for parliamentary support by the English bishops for any removal of the disabilities.

Forbes denounced the proposed bargain. Whatever they each thought of the Scottish Office he thought that surely "our reputations will not allow us to give it up as the price of the removal of the disabilities". To call a General Synod on such a basis, Forbes felt, would be to put temptation in the way of the clergy, "risking a schism between the north and the south". He continued to place the blame for such a bargain on the Evangelicals in the Church of England, assessing the situation accordingly:

> they [the Evangelicals] fear & dislike the dogmatic teaching, which our very position as an antagonist of the Kirk inclines us to. They will therefore reject us tooth & nail, and if they do so, we may be very sure that they whom we sought to conciliate by the abandonment of the Office, will be the first to fling that abandonment in our faces. [22]

Fearful of the lack of support for the Communion Office among the clergy Forbes did not want a General Synod which would only allow the clergy a direct control over developments. Preferring to keep the issue within the ranks of the bishops for the present, he argued for an Episcopal rather than a General Synod.

The bishops met in conference in Edinburgh on 26 February. The primus informed them he had replied to Sumner, stating that it was not within their power to set aside the Scottish Office. This could only be done by a General Synod, and such a synod would probably meet soon to consider a revision to the Code of Canons. However, he would give the archbishop no undertaking regarding the Office. The bishops approved the reply, which was sent on 27 February. Eventually it was decided to permit the appointed committee on the disabilities to consult widely on possible further action, and also to call a General Synod for 8 July 1862 for the purpose of canonical revision. [23] In a letter to Bishop Tait of London the following day Terrot explicitly mentioned that the canon about the Scottish Office would come up for debate at the prospective General Synod. [24]

A few days later Forbes informed Gladstone about the calling of a General Synod which he claimed was ostensibly about revision of the canons but, in fact, was really "to get rid of the Scottish Office", as preparation for the campaign against their legal disabilities. As he stood alone in deprecating the move, Forbes said he feared nothing could be done. [25] This attempt to enlist Gladstone's powerful political influence succeeded in raising the statesman's indignation against the possible bargain. Gladstone replied on 3 March saying he thought such a scheme "inadmissable, nay even despicable". According to Gladstone, it was the reversal of religious principles for an essentially civil advantage. Gladstone also assured Forbes that Sir William Heathcote, the other member for Oxford University, supported him in this understanding. [26] Forbes lost no time in sending a copy of Gladstone's letter to Robert Eden, whom he saw as a supporter in any campaign for the Scottish Office. [27] Eden responded quickly, saying he was relieved by the attitude of the two M.P.'s although he still thought that, even with such support, they would make little impression on the other bishops. Indignantly,

Eden (an Englishman) asked, "is the Church of England to be Pope? Is she to be the judge of what is and what is not a National Church? & is she to dictate to other Churches what their rites, forms & ceremonies may be?" [28] Forbes' securing of Gladstone's political support against the possible trade-off was further strengthened when Gladstone told Eden he would feel himself at liberty to propose an amendment to a disabilities removal bill if it should come tied to such a bargain, or "to oppose it altogether in Parliament". [29]

Before the battle could be properly joined, or perhaps because of its prospect, Charles Terrot notified the bishops of his intention to resign as primus. The election of a new primus became a crucial issue because of the division over the Scottish Office. Although the primus' role was largely confined to chairing the Episcopal and General Synods, it lay in his power to call the General Synod and it was within that arena that the conflict over the Office would be focused, centering on the revision of the canons, and particularly amendment to canon 21 which gave the Scottish Office "primary authority" in the Church. The proposed revision would be fought in a succession of General Synod meetings where the primus, as chairman, was influential. This made the role of the primus more important to both antagonists and supporters of the Scottish Office than it might otherwise have been, and a lot of lobbying went on among the bishops to secure a favourable candidate.

Wilson of Glasgow was Forbes' initial candidate. Forbes had sounded him out in a conversation in the Caledonian Hotel in Edinburgh, presumably during the last meeting of the bishops in February 1862. Wilson, however, drew attention to his being the junior among the bishops, as the most recently consecrated. [30] Terrot asked Forbes on 20 March 1862 if he had also received "a letter from the North",

(presumably from Eden), suggesting Wordsworth for primus on the grounds that he was a scholar. The primus was disturbed about this possibility for he thought "a clear head, habits of business, freedom from crochets, a cool temper, & civil (if we can̂o̊t have a conciliating) manners" more important for the position of primus than scholarship. Terrot evidently considered these qualities lacking in the belligerent Wordsworth, and agreed with Forbes in supporting Wilson. [31] After receiving a letter of support from the primus, Wilson indicated to Forbes that he would consider offering himself if a majority supported him, but that he did not want a contest. [32] Wilson's candidature, however, began to founder on the opposition of Eden who thought him too conservative and said he had been particularly struck by "the tone of almost ridicule with wh he treated the notion of our Church's *nationality*". If Eden was so opposed to Wilson it raises the question of why Forbes did not support Eden from the beginning? Eden was surely the better candidate from Forbes' point of view as he had already expressed his support for the Scottish Office. Forbes probably had a personal reason for not preferring Eden. In a letter in April 1865 to his chaplain Roger Lingard, Forbes said he felt that Eden had betrayed him over the judgement on his primary charge. Eden, Forbes thought, had initially favoured Forbes but had allowed himself to be overruled at the trial by Wordsworth. Forbes commented, "I have never quite got over that". [33] If Forbes felt betrayed by Eden in 1865 then he was obviously still strongly ambivalent towards him three years earlier. Eden was someone Forbes needed as a fellow-supporter of the Scottish Office, but he also felt injured by him. It was this emotional ambivalence that prevented Forbes supporting Eden as his first choice for primus. Forbes must have understood he stood no chance of election himself so soon after the eucharistic controversy, with the strong antipathies he had aroused among the bishops, especially Wordsworth and Suther. But the prospect of Wilson as primus was not gaining ground so by April 1862 Forbes was

having to consider supporting Eden. On 10 April Eden was telling him he thought Forbes' vote for him would be thrown away because, personal unworthiness aside, Eden emphasized he was an Englishman. [34] Eventually the choice began to resolve itself as one between Eden and Wordsworth, with Eden having the stronger support. At the Episcopal Synod on 5 July 1862, held in conjunction with the General Synod, Terrot formally resigned as primus and Eden was elected in his place. [35]

During this lobbying the manoeuv ring over the Scottish Office and the clerical disabilities went on. Terrot was particularly worried about the lack of competent clerical applicants for congregations in his diocese, and thought the removal of the disabilities would encourage candidates from England to be ordained into the Episcopal Church. [36] Gladstone's letter of support was now causing concern to Ewing, the principal episcopal opponent of the Scottish Communion Office. [37] Forbes admitted to Ewing that he had circularized the letter so the bishops could become aware of the opinions of such influential figures as Gladstone and Heathcote. [38]

But Forbes was having difficulty in rousing supporters of the Communion Office, even among northern Churchmen who could be expected to support this exemplar of their own traditions. Some of his difficulties were indicated in a letter he received from Robert Thom, a prominent northern Churchman in his own diocese. Forbes had sent him a letter from Terrot, who had said the southern clergy believed that to retain the Office while removing the disabilities was to attempt the impossible. Thom thought that there was much to be said for Terrot's observations. England and Scotland seemed to be growing into a closer unity, which made it increasingly difficult for the Episcopal Church to justify a different ritual

from the Church of England. He said he did not want to be understood as being personally inclined to relinquish the Scottish Office, and added that for him the removal of the disabilities was "a matter of utter indifference". Thom's main concern was what he referred to as "the settlement of our own Church on a united Catholic basis, which will allow her to pursue with undivided energies the work of winning back to the Unity of the One Body & Faith of Christ a lost people". But this, he thought, could never be accomplished while Episcopalians were still wrangling among themselves over two "*equally modern forms*" of liturgy. As long as the unity, catholicity and independence of the Episcopal Church was maintained Thom would be content with the English Office, although he would personally prefer the Scottish one. Thom claimed he would never surrender the Scottish Office on the grounds of its teaching erroneous doctrine, but neither would he maintain it as the cost of the Church's unity. [39]

Thom's letter must have been discouraging to Forbes, coming as it did from a northern Churchman willing to concede the possibility of the Scottish Office's demise. It was hardly the sort of determined opposition to the Office's abolition Forbes needed. Against fierce antagonism to the Office Forbes needed equally convinced defenders, rather than a willingness to compromise too soon. Perhaps his difficulties in stimulating enthusiastic protagonists brought on further personal depression for Forbes. In March 1862 Keble received what he called "a sad letter" from Forbes. Evidently, Forbes was still uncertain about Anglicanism, for Keble advised him that while he was still doubtful "he should not decide against us", and he urged Forbes to further prayer and meditation for guidance. [40]

Both Keble and Pusey were opposed to the loss of the Scottish Office and advised Forbes accordingly. Pusey considered it would disgrace the Episcopal

Church, alienate the Church's friends in England, and be a sacrifice of belief. [41] Keble told Forbes the abandonment of the Office would appear to be a desertion of the "high and primitive truth" of the early Church. He was hopeful of finding enough support for the Office among English Churchpeople so as to lessen the effect of the English bishops' demand for abolition. In offering this encouragement Keble had regard for Forbes' own spiritual indecision. Keble was hoping Forbes would not give in to the "desponding thoughts which I know are too likely to come thronging upon you in such an emergency". [42]

Early in April 1862 Gladstone advised Eden to postpone lobbying for any bill on the removal of the disabilities if there was any intention on the part of the Scottish bishops to alter the position of the Scottish Office. As a counter to the demands of the English bishops for the Office's abolition, Gladstone downplayed their parliamentary influence. He considered that they were more effective in preventing measures than in advocating them. Therefore any bill proposed by the Episcopal Church needed their support, but such support did not necessarily guarantee success. [43]

The draft revision of the code of canons had finally been completed by the appointed committee and was sent to the various dioceses for consideration by their synods. There seems no record of this draft in the papers of the General Synod office of the Episcopal Church, but it must have severely threatened the place of the Scottish Communion Office if the consternation of Forbes and Eden is any measure. On 9 April, Eden wrote to Forbes hoping that a decided expression of opinion in favour of the Office from Moray and Brechin synods would increase the pressure to maintain the Office. [44] Forbes replied with an outline of proposed campaign tactics. He wanted to encourage Gladstone and other friendly members of

Parliament to delay supporting any bill for the removal of the disabilities until the Office was secured. Forbes believed that if such a commitment could be brought to the attention of advocates of the bargain it would influence their policy. As well, Forbes intended at his diocesan synod that year to encourage the Brechin clergy to vote for a canon allowing the Office in new congregations. [45] It may have been these suggestions of Forbes that caused Gladstone to contact Ewing expressing his opposition to the loss of the Scottish Office. Gladstone reminded Ewing of his influence within the Episcopal Church by stating that if the proposed bargain had been advocated at the time of building Trinity College the college would not have been built. [46]

Despite the apparent success of Forbes' political strategy he remained anxious. A possible revision of the *epiclesis** in the Scottish Office's eucharistic prayer worried him particularly. [47] As Forbes no doubt knew, this proposal originated with Bishop Wordsworth, who raised it publicly at his diocesan synod in September 1862. In reaction to a suggestion from George Forbes, (to alter the *epiclesis* according to the wording of the Liturgy of St. James), Wordsworth proposed an alteration to use the words of the 1549 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* - that the bread and wine "may be unto us" the body and blood of Christ. Such a change, according to Forbes, would have made the presence of Christ in the sacrament rest on the subjective grounds of the worshipper's faith. Given his position in the recent eucharistic controversy, Forbes viewed such a threat to the objectivity of the real presence very seriously. But his commitment to the objectivity of sacramental grace was not his sole reason for supporting the Scottish

---

*see note p.26.

Communion Office. To Forbes, the Office was also a sign of the Episcopal Church's attachment to the Catholic authority of the early Church, because he understood that rite as being closer to the liturgies of the patristic Church than was the English liturgy. Indeed, the Scottish Office was one of the few things keeping Forbes from converting to Roman Catholicism. It was this personal need of the Office as a sign of the Catholic nature of the Episcopal Church that caused Forbes to fight so strenuously for its continued retention. Few on either side of the struggle can have realised that the demise of the Scottish Office could also have meant the scandal of the conversion of a bishop to Rome, a conversion that would have approached Newman's in its effect on the confidence of Anglo-Catholics.

Pusey wrote to Forbes on 2 May 1862 trying to put the revision of the canonical place of the Office on a less exalted plane than Forbes understood it to be. The revision was not a change in doctrine, contended Pusey, but only an ecclesiastical or institutional one. He also pointedly claimed it was not divisions within the Church that most hurt the faith of Churchpeople, but rather secessions from it. [48] Forbes was planning to spend some time with Pusey in Oxford, and in order to prepare for the visit Pusey asked Keble for advice about Forbes' contention that opposition to the Office was a denial of divine truth. [49] Keble replied on 4 May pointing out that many convinced Tractarians or Anglo-Catholics actually disliked the Scottish Office, believing it to be more dissimilar to the Roman rite than the *Book of Common Prayer*. But Forbes' identification of Catholic truth with similarity to the early Church had convinced him that the alteration of patristic features of the Scottish Office such as its *epiclesis* (not part of the eucharistic liturgy of the *Book of Common Prayer*) or the Office's total abolition would be a departure from Catholic truth. The fact that Forbes' understanding was not shared by other leaders of the Catholic revival is an

indication of just how personally attached he was to the Office. It had become his lifeline to Anglicanism.

But in May 1862 that lifeline had become very fragile. Forbes now intended to call on Newman at the Birmingham oratory during his trip south to Oxford. This markedly increased the anxiety of the Tractarian leaders. Pusey feared that the Birmingham visit could have only one end - the bishop's secession. [50] Keble referred to Forbes' "temper and excitement", and suggested that Forbes was insufficiently aware of God's "*fatherly* love". [51] Forbes intended to give Newman no prior warning of his impending visit, claiming to see divine guidance in whatever eventuated when he arrived at Birmingham. [52] Meanwhile, Pusey and Keble maintained a vigil of prayer, anxiously awaiting Forbes' arrival at Oxford.

Forbes called on Newman at the oratory in Edg baston on 15 May but found him away from home. When Forbes arrived at Christ Church that evening a relieved Pusey told Keble that "the immediate peril is past", but added that Forbes remained despondent about the Church and fearful of death. Presumably, Pusey meant Forbes feared the possibility of his dying outside the Catholic Church while he was still unsure just where that was to be located. [53] Keble was thankful for "the reprieve", but grieved at his own inability to do anything to help. He asked that Forbes be assured of his own "deep, deep love". [54]

Accepting for the present the failure to see Newman in Birmingham as God's will, Forbes worked with Pusey in Oxford to draft a new canon on the Scottish Office, which he then sent to Eden. [55] By now support for the proposed trade-off between abolition of the Scottish Communion Office and removing the disabilities had grown. Supporters of the trade-off included such influential figures

as Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford and Dean Ramsay in Edinburgh. However, Gladstone continued to exercise his powerful influence against the bargain. He wrote to Wilberforce on 28 June warning that if such a bargain was concluded with Wilberforce's approval "the relations between us are new relations" and that Gladstone would have to "consider my course afresh upon many matters". [56] Gladstone wrote in the same vein to Ramsay. [57] Writing to Forbes on 5 July, the day the Episcopal Synod met to elect a new primus, Gladstone harked back to the days when he and James Hope founded Trinity College. At that time, it seemed to Gladstone, the English Office of the *Book of Common Prayer* was the preference only of wealthy Episcopalians as a result of their contact with England. But he had been confident of the continuing place of the Scottish Communion Office because, at that time, it was dear to "native and poorer" Episcopalians, and the bishops of the period "prized that office...at least as dearly as their own lives". To eliminate the use of the Scottish Office Gladstone considered an act of bad faith to the agreement given to the college founders. With the next General Synod meeting three days away, Gladstone authorized Forbes to bring his letter to the notice of the other bishops. [58]

The General Synod met in Freemasons Hall, in George Street, Edinburgh, on 8 July 1862, to proceed with the most extensive revision of the Code of Canons in the Episcopal Church to that time. After intensive consideration for eight days the revised draft was sent back to the diocesan synods for further consideration and the synod adjourned until 30 September 1862. [59] Insofar as the Scottish Office was concerned the General Synod went badly for Forbes. The proposed canon 36 declared it was expedient to have as little diversity as possible between the Episcopal Church and "sister Churches" of the United Kingdom. In consequence, the English *Book of Common Prayer* was to be adopted as "the only service book

of this Church". The proposed Canon 37 allowed existing congregations to continue using the Scottish Office if they presently did so, but all new congregations had to adopt the English prayer book. [60] Pusey described Forbes as returning to Dundee "half-dead", and "sickened at the miserably low religious tone of the Synod, the hopes of twenty years blighted". Appalled at the strength of opposition to the Scottish Office Forbes developed a nervous tic at nights worrying over what he understood to be a betrayal of apostolic truth. [61] Forbes may also have feared the personal consequences of losing his lifeline to Anglicanism. He would have known that his secession to Rome would probably have resulted in the loss of many valued friendships and relationships. Especially for a celibate, such friendships were an important source of personal comfort and self-esteem. If this was a component of his fretfulness it was not without foundation. In 1851 Gladstone had cut off his closest friends, James Hope and Henry Manning, when they became Roman Catholics. Forbes must have known he could expect no less.

But the battle for the Scottish Office would not be over until the revision of the canons was finalised at the forthcoming meetings of the General Synod beginning in late September. Forbes now proposed a compromise solution, in his annual address to his diocesan synod which was held on 27 August 1862, (later than usual in order to give the clergy time to consider the redrafted canons from General Synod). He devoted his address to the two "great questions" still outstanding at General Synod, namely the Office and admission of laity into synods. Forbes reiterated his usual objection to the *Book of Common Prayer*. He understood the authorized liturgies of the Church to be transmitters of its doctrine. Therefore, to displace the Scottish Office was to question the Episcopal Church's faithful transmission of the faith. Changing liturgies, he believed, also changed the symbolic representation of the Church's doctrine. While he was prepared, he said,

to relinquish the description of the Office under the old canon 21 as having "primary authority", he would not agree to any canonical change which did not explicitly describe the alteration as a matter merely of ecclesiastical organisation and not of doctrine. Regarding proposals to alter the Office itself, Forbes argued these would be a surrender to the schismatic Drummondites, who had separated themselves from the Episcopal Church precisely because they objected to the Scottish Office. According to Forbes the present was a period of poor faith due to growing religious doubt, and was therefore an unsatisfactory time to change a liturgy that had proved itself capable of sustaining the faith of Episcopalians during the persecutions of the previous century. He warned that any alteration to the formularies of the Church would reopen the eucharistic controversy. The present formularies, he maintained, were capable of being interpeted favourably by either side in the recent controversy, but any new formula would be unlikely to satisfy all parties and could well result in schism. Forbes also objected to a fundamental change in the place of the office being carried in General Synod by a simple majority. Then he outlined his proposed conciliation. Supporters of the Office would concede its primary authority and allow the *Book of Common Prayer* to enjoy equal authority. In return, Forbes suggested, there should be a canonical preamble stating that the change in the Scottish Office's position was simply a matter of discipline. Congregations presently using the Office should be permitted to continue doing so, and new congregations be allowed its use also if so requested by a majority of the congregation. A change to either liturgy from an existing use should be permitted only if desired by two-thirds of regular communicants in a congregation. If such conditions were granted, Forbes believed Scottish Office supporters could "rest content, if not satisfied". Forbes then said briefly he accepted the canons regarding lay involvement in the election of bishops insofar as they accorded the laity their ancient right to accept or reject such an election. But he

was against the laity becoming part of normal synods as this meant they became part of the teaching authority of the Church which, he believed, was limited to the clergy. [62]

According to Pusey, Forbes' proposals in his synod charge were not those of a man who had accepted the threatened changes to the Scottish Office, but rather he said, the calm of one who had made up his mind about what he should do. Forbes had told Pusey he expected his course of action to be clear by the end of the year but for now he awaited events, by which Pusey took him to mean that if there was an improvement in the position of the Scottish Office he would stay on; if not he would resign. Pusey believed this meant Forbes would "leave everything". [63]

But Forbes was not content merely to await developments. During August 1862 he approached Gilbert Rorison, a senior priest of Aberdeen diocese and a leader among those planning to adopt the *Book of Common Prayer* in place of the Scottish Office. Forbes wrote to him on 11 August to recommend the compromise he had advocated in his synod charge. Forbes warned that if the present draft canon about the Scottish Office were carried it would leave "a sense of intolerable wrong" among supporters of the Office that would only lead to further agitation. He also warned that supporters among the clergy might petition Parliament not to revoke the disabilities. Such a petition would have been fatal to any bill for their removal as suggesting that Parliament was involving itself in a religious controversy. Forbes affirmed that such a petition would have his own support which was not without important influence. "And I may say for myself, that I shd use my

endeavour to induce Mr Gladstone, Lord Robert Cecil & Mr Lygon* - as well as any other friends I had in Parliament, *to delay* their support of any bill until our grievances were redressed." Having threatened real political consequences for any disabilities bill Forbes went on to hold out a carrot in place of the stick. He said supporters of the Office accepted they were in a minority and would not ask the earth. However, they did demand as the basis of a compromise that the Office be permitted in new congregations and that either liturgy could be adopted by any congregation where two thirds of the people and their clergyman wanted it; also, that there be a preamble in the canon to "preserve in some shape the dogmatic authority of the Office". [64] Forbes endeavoured to back up his presage to Rorison by asking his brother George if some of his fellow-supporters of the Office among the clergy in Scottish orders would write to Rorison threatening to petition Parliament against the removal of the disabilities if the Scottish Office were not granted toleration. [65] Forbes' campaign was boosted on the day he wrote to Rorison by a letter of support from the Earl of Morton who wanted to have the Scottish Office used in the chapel he was building at his highland seat. [66]

Rorison responded to Forbes on 16 August claiming he did not fear the tactics of any clerical opposition. The present contest was, Rorison believed, between those to whom the Scottish Office was paramount to any other consideration, and those - "an immense majority" - to whom other issues, such as the peace of the Church and the development of a cultivated native clergy, were more important than questions about offices. But he was willing to accomodate the

---

* Frederick Lygon, (1830-91), Tory M.P. for Tewkesbury and then for West Worcestershire until 1866 when he succeeded as sixth Earl Beauchamp. [DNB., xxxiv, 324-5.]

minority if such an adjustment could be consistent with the consciences of the majority. Rorison had most misgivings about the use of the Office in new congregations. He might accept alternate use of both liturgies in new congregations, but in existing congregations he would not concede that the Scottish Office might be permitted to supplant the *Book of Common Prayer*. This was the maximum concession Rorison said he would support. But he would only support it if he could alter the Scottish Office's *epiclesis* according to Wordsworth's proposal. Further, he would only press for such a compromise "on the understanding that Mr Gladstone & others will in that case be prepared to throw their whole influence to the minimizing of that opposition which concession may tend to stimulate". [67]

Forbes wrote back to Rorison on 18 August to say that all negotiations must be founded on an unaltered Scottish Office. In this, Forbes said, he was confident he could also speak for Gladstone. [68] The threat of Gladstone's disapproval again did the trick and Rorison agreed the next day not to demand any change to the Office and to propose the conciliation on the terms he had originally outlined to Forbes. [69] But Rorison's counter-proposal was not satisfactory to Forbes, who opposed alternate use of both liturgies in a single congregation. Writing to Rorison on 21 August Forbes outlined the compromise as he saw it. Supporters of the Office would agree not to petition Parliament against the disabilities bill, and Forbes and others would use their influence with Gladstone and other parliamentarians to support the bill. In return, Rorison and his supporters would accept an unaltered Office; support a canonical preamble that the liturgical change was merely disciplinary while giving "honourable mention to the Scottish Office"; and accept Forbes' proposal of liturgical use in new or existing congregations. If this was acceptable to Rorison, Forbes would send their correspondence to Gladstone for his response. [70] Rorison still wanted to take further counsel on the

matter of the congregations, and stressed again that his ability to promote the conciliation would depend on its having Gladstone's support. [71]

Gladstone's response was sent to Forbes on 30 August 1862, stating that Gladstone considered himself technically a "stranger" to the Episcopal Church, residing as he did outside Scotland. Therefore, should the canon about the Scottish Office pass he would simply withdraw all support for the Scottish Episcopal Church, "except with particular persons or institutions". Having thus indicated his continued support for Forbes no matter what happened to the Scottish Office, Gladstone gave him what he wanted in agreeing that the cardinal point at issue was the liberty of new congregations to adopt the Scottish Office if they wished, and that he would "value no other concession". Gladstone then backed up Forbes' threat about political influence. "To any Bill in name or substance founded on a theological bargain between the Scottish Episcopal Communion and the English Bishops I should be opposed", he affirmed, and agreed that any opposition to a disabilities bill by a portion of the clergy or laity of the Episcopal Church would prove fatal to such a bill. [72]

Faced with Gladstone's overwhelming endorsement for Forbes' plan Rorison agreed on 9 September that if he could get his bishop's permission, he would then move at the Aberdeen synod that their delegate to the General Synod be instructed to support the compromise. But Rorison still hoped to maintain something of his own proposal and so wanted to ask Gladstone if he would support alternate use in new congregations. Rorison had a healthy respect for Gladstone's political influence, maintaining that Gladstone was "the virtual *controller* of such personal hostility in the one quarter [i.e. Parliament] where it would be fatal to us". [73] On 15 September Gladstone observed to Forbes that Rorison's suggestion only gave

congregations a choice between the exclusive use of the English office, and the alternate use of it and the Scottish, which was not an equitable choice. [74] Having no possible doubts now about the strength of Gladstone's support for Forbes' political threat Rorison capitulated and on 25 September agreed to the compromise as Forbes understood it. [75]

During this time Forbes was seeking further support for his proposed settlement. He had evidently sent copies of his last synod charge outlining his proposals to various people as a means of garnering support for his compromise settlement. Eden wrote to him on 3 September saying that the Moray synod had agreed almost unamimously to the points Forbes had suggested in his charge. [76] Forbes had sent his charge to his nephew, George Boyle, the most influential layman in the Diocese of Argyll and the Isles. But Boyle had to report that a motion based on Forbes' compromise was defeated in that synod. [77] Pusey also received a letter from Forbes, probably in September, asking him to write to the *Guardian* against Wordsworth's proposed alteration to the Communion Office. [78]

But the General Synod meeting, which reconvened on 30 September, did not tackle the canon concerning the Scottish Office. It only passed those permitting lay representatives at the election of bishops and then adjourned until 3 February 1863. [79] Pusey and Keble, meanwhile, were growing more and more anxious about the effect of the battle on Forbes' uncertainty about the Episcopal Church. Pusey had observed that the canonical revision had stimulated the bishop's doubts "into a fever". [80] In October, their concern increased when Forbes appeared favourably impressed by something Cardinal Manning had written about the infallible *magisterium* of the papacy, possibly *The Temporal Power of the Pope*, published that year. Forbes had thought the argument logical and so Pusey had sent a long

letter in refutation. Pusey observed that underneath his outward calm Forbes was in a "terrible panic" and that he had once again been worried by the debates at General Synod. This time Forbes was "cast down" because the clergy had refused to be bound by a proposal that the Church accept as a theological standard the decisions of the first four General Councils of the patristic Church. [81] There is no record of the debates in the minutes of the General Synod, but a proposal about the General Councils possibly came from Forbes or some other Tractarian among whom such Councils were generally regarded as theologically authoritative for the contemporary Church.

Joseph Robertson in Edinburgh was keeping Forbes informed about developments in the south. He believed what pressure for revision of the Scottish Communion Office there was came either from a small group, prompted by George Forbes, who wanted it revised in a high direction; or from Wordsworth, who was threatening to resign if the office was not revised in a low direction. [82] Forbes wrote to his brother in November 1862 arguing that an unrevised Office had the best chance of securing toleration. He also continued to be worried about the dismissal of the authority of the four General Councils by members of the General Synod, stating, "I cannot trust my soul in a Church which ignores them". [83]

During the past two months Forbes had been unsettled by clergy refusing to acknowledge the authority of the General Councils, and by Manning's argument for an infallible papacy. The eucharistic controversy had previously disrupted Forbes' confidence in the catholicity of Anglican divines and in Episcopalian belief in an objective eucharistic presence of Christ. Now he was hoping to see the General Councils acknowledged by the Episcopal Church as having doctrinal authority and discovered this also was unacceptable. It would appear that Forbes was engaged at

this time in a desperate search for an objective authority for Christian belief on which he could confidently rest his belief that the Anglican Church was Catholic. The lack of acceptance for those authorities he did propose made it all the more necessary to secure the one that some agreed about and which had traditional authority within the Episcopal Church - the Scottish Communion Office. That lack of acceptance also made the claims for infallibility from Roman Catholics such as Manning seem all the more attractive. It was not only a matter of the intellectual basis for faith but, as he told his brother, a concern for the salvation of his soul within the Catholic Church. If Forbes could not be sure where that Church was, then he could not be confident of his salvation.

Resignation was once more in Forbes' thoughts and Joseph Robertson endeavoured to keep him from it by persuading the bishop that he was the only link between the present Episcopal Church and that of the nonjuring days*. Robertson asked Forbes to remember the fiery example of his predecesssor in Brechin, Bishop Walter Whiteford, "who is said to have read the Service Book of 1638 in his cathedral church with a pair of pistols on the desk beside him. *He*", said Robertson pointedly, "went to England and ended his days there...but it was not until he had been excommunicated in Scotland, and driven from it by brute force." [84]

* Robertson was not just being rhetorical, for leading northern Churchmen were deserting the Scottish Office in preference for the English. Included among them was John Torry, son of Bishop Patrick Torry and Dean of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane. He expressed his desire that nothing should be done to support the Scottish Office and the hope it would soon die out. [SEJ., February 1863, 25.]

The possibility of alteration to the Communion Office now came to dominate Forbes' anxieties. At the beginning of 1863 Forbes believed that the bishops who stood for non-alteration of the office were Terrot, Morrell*, Wilson and himself. [85] Writing to Pusey from Dublin, where he was engaged in historical research, Forbes said those in favour of revising the Office were Wordsworth, Eden, and Ewing, while Suther was doubtful. He believed there was a good chance of his position gaining majority support at the next meeting of the General Synod, but suspected revision would win in the lower house of the clergy. Pusey still feared the effect on Forbes of the debate at the next General Synod meeting, namely, that the mundane language and lack of acknowledgement of divine guidance of synods would make Forbes feel "that they and he belong to different systems, i.e., that they have not the Catholic faith". [86] Pusey's anxiety grew when he did not hear from Forbes concerning his invitation to come to Christ Church that January. He knew Forbes did not like travelling in winter, but even more he did not like coming to see Pusey while he was still harassed. Pusey now opened every letter of Forbes' dreading its news. Once again, looking towards the outcome of the General Synod in February, the two Tractarian leaders feared the worst for their friend.

The General Synod resumed its sittings on 3 February 1863 and continued to meet until 13 February. Most of the time was spent making small alterations to the proposed Code of Canons according to various amendments voted for at the diocesan synods. But the major event was the debate on the Scottish Office which

---

* Charles Terrot had reluctantly bowed to pressure from his diocese and the other bishops and accepted the election of a coadjutor because of his increasing paralysis. Thomas Morrell, at the time of his election in January 1863 incumbent of Henley, was the first bishop to be elected under the new canons at a synod involving lay representatives. [REC.III., 2 February 1863, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 86-90.]

continued from 10 to 12 February. On 10 February the primus, Robert Eden, tabled various petitions and memorials concerning the Office. Included among them was a petition from the "Clergy & Laity of the Church of England" against giving up the Scottish Communion Office in return for the removal of the disabilities. It contained 311 signatures, including Pusey, Keble, and all the leading Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics. [87] Eden then moved that the *Book of Common Prayer* be used in all new congregations, unless the incumbent and the majority of communicants desired the Scottish Office. Forbes reluctantly supported this, probably because it still left the *Book of Common Prayer* as the authorized service at diocesan level, namely at all consecrations, ordinations and synods. Eden's motion passed in the upper house and passed in the lower house of the clergy on 11 February with slight amendment. The clergy then returned the amended motion to the house of bishops, who considered it for the last time in a tense debate on 12 February. Eden thought the canon now represented compromise by both sides. He said it gave the *Book of Common Prayer* canonical acceptance, and disallowed departure from it except in the case of a majority of communicants in new congregations, while for the Scottish Office it meant toleration. He therefore proposed they accept the canon as sent back to them by the lower house. Forbes seconded the motion as being the best the majority (which ever side that was) would grant, and if this proposal was not passed then that majority would hold out for more stringent terms. Ewing proposed they adhered to the canon as originally drafted in July 1862 and this was seconded by Suther. Wilson, as usual, had difficulty making up his mind. Eventually, the primus moved the canon be adopted with the further amendment of giving the bishop power to refuse the use of the Scottish Office if he considered undue influence had been put on the requesting congregation. Aware of the reluctance of three of their number Forbes seconded this as the best deal obtainable and it passed, reluctantly supported by Suther but

opposed by Ewing. It was sent back to the clergy who again passed it with minor alteration and was finally agreed to by both chambers on 12 February.* [88]

Forbes' immediate reaction was relief at having secured toleration for the Scottish Office. So strong was this feeling that, on 12 February, he wrote Pusey a note from the synod room itself, giving his quick assessment of the gains and losses, and feeling that on the whole things had gone better than expected. The gains as far as Forbes was concerned were that there was no revision of the Scottish Communion Office, no discussion on doctrine, toleration of the Office, and no vote for the laity in synod, but only at the election of bishops. The losses were that eucharistic vestments were sacrificed (in Canon 32), and the General Councils not admitted to be authoritative in the Episcopal Church. [89] He had another opportunity to express his feelings during the speeches on the final day when the two chambers met together. Forbes said he felt a "deep thankfulness to Almighty God" for what had happened at the synod. Considering the differences of opinions and the strong views of synod members he thought the unanimity they had found was "something very remarkable".** [90]

* See appendix.

** One who could not reconcile himself to the Scottish Office's demotion was George Forbes. He appealed against the 1863 canons to the Episcopal Synod and, having his appeal turned down, took the issue into the civil courts, as far as the House of Lords. In March 1867 his case, (that the Episcopal Church was acting *ultra vires* in revoking the primary authority of the Scottish Office), which he ably defended himself, was rejected, compelling George to submit to the 1863 Canons. [W.Perry, *George Hay Forbes*, (1927), 94-103.]

Following the General Synod of February 1863 Forbes went to the continent on holiday and returned in June feeling better in health and more relaxed about his spiritual difficulties. [91] This feeling of confidence was evident in his address to the Brechin synod that year where he allowed himself a little optimism in reviewing the Church's contemporary outlook, and brought together his concern about *Essays and Reviews* and the divisions over the Scottish Office under the theme of Church unity. Speaking about "the very remarkable exhibition of skepticism in religion which has ocurred lately in this country" Forbes believed that religious faith was currently retreating before the advance of empirical science, German thought, *Essays and Reviews* and Bishop Colenso's work on the Old Testament incorporating higher criticism.* He expected things to get worse if they were not remedied. But among remedial signs he referred to the rise of a "truer metaphysical science" which accepted the existence of the supernatural, by which he possibly meant the revival of scholasticism underway in Italy during the early 1860's. [92] Forbes could well have known of this from his travels in Italy and his contacts in the Church there. He himself used scholastic philosophy extensively in his own theological works. Alternatively, he may have meant the renewal of interest in metaphysical philosophy created by F.D.Maurice's *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, published in 1861. But because he recognised that philosophy may only address intellectual difficulties without touching inner conviction he returned to the remedy of authority. The "essence of justifying faith", he said, "is that it is belief upon authority...for all belief implies a certain submission of the soul to an external authority, inwrought by the Holy Ghost, and intimately affected by the moral

---

* John William Colenso, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, (1862-3).

condition of the believer in the sight of God". For Forbes this external authority was the Church, as a sort of sacrament of Christ, the outward and visible form of Christ as the divine truth. Therefore, anything which harmed the authority of the Church was a threat to faith. Such a threat, he believed, came from the Church's disunity. Christian unity was a witness to the truth of Christianity, while disunity threatened the Church's authority. Forbes criticized two bases for unity - what he called la titudinarianism and syncretism. These positions, meant Christianity "contains no one definite message, creed or system". Nor did Forbes hold any brief for those who argued for belief only in "essentials" because he thought it was impossible to define just what these were, and finite beings had no right to so classify a divine message. Finally, he spoke about the other form of unity - the Church of Rome - and said, "No one can deny that the aspect she presents in this respect [unity] is striking, claiming as she does, her subjects in every clime, race and civilization". But imposing as this was to Forbes he still considered it an imperfect unity because it did not comprehend the Orthodox Church, nor the Anglican Church, nor, (surprisingly), "all that is good and pious in the Protestant bodies". However, he hoped that as transport developed, wearing away isolation and differences of opinion, there would be a General Council to bring about Christian unity as a testament to belief, a Christianity which would be "organised, hierarchical, and dogmatic". [93]

The final resolution of the canonical authority of the Scottish Communion Office and the *Book of Common Prayer* meant the bishops could return their attention directly to the campaign for the legal removal of the clergy's disabilities in England. By February 1864 the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry had agreed to introduce a bill to this effect in the House of Lords. Forbes wrote to Gladstone on 8 February to ask if the time was propitious for the bill in the House of

Commons. What particularly worried him was opposition from members from the Church of Scotland and the Free Church. These, Forbes said, "wd risk their seats if they supported us, in view of the increasing jealousy of the Established and Free Churches. That jealousy is undeniable and arises mainly from the gradual loss of the younger members, [to the Episcopal Church] which both these bodies, especially the former, are sustaining." [94] By April a petition to Parliament for removal of the disabilities had been organized among Episcopalian congregations. [95]

But by 1864 Forbes was once again on the see-saw of his religious doubts. While staying with Pusey in June Forbes asked him to write to Keble about his predicament before he went on to visit him at Hursley. Forbes was now thinking he had deliberately deluded himself into remaining a bishop, and was also speaking of having no faith in "his system". Pusey thought this could be a fear that the Anglican Church would not last. Forbes' intermittent ill-health contributed to the rise of such fears, according to Pusey. But he thought the point that most worried Forbes now was whether he was right in continuing as a bishop feeling as he did. When Pusey pointed out to him the fruitfulness of his ministry Forbes could only fasten upon intermarriages taking Episcopalians out of their Church. This, presumably, for Forbes, was an indication that some Episcopalians did not see any important difference between their Church and others. [96] After talking with Forbes at Hursley Keble felt more hopeful. He was reassured by the fact that Forbes had preached there on the Sunday morning, which was something Keble had not been able to get him to do before. Keble also felt Forbes needed rest "rather than intellectual conviction that Rome is right", and he begged him to "think of the terrible consequences of such moves as he is tempted to, I mean on others in prompting unbelief". [97]

The Scottish Episcopal Clergy Disabilities Removal Bill was introduced into the House of Lords by Walter Scott, the Duke of Buccleuch, on 10 May 1864. [98] Although an Episcopalian, Buccleuch was a believer in Established Churches and a known benefactor of the Church of Scotland. He was the ideal figure to allay Church of Scotland anxieties about the measure signifying a threat to the Scottish Establishment. Buccleuch deliberately took steps to mollify such fears by circulating copies of the bill at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland which met in mid-May. The Assembly remitted the bill to a committee which reported it did not affect the Church of Scotland but was a matter only for the Church of England and Ireland. The General Assembly's acceptance had an important effect in favour of the bill's support in Parliament. [99] The bill had its second reading in the Lords on 26 May when the Scottish bishops' fears about opposition from the English bishops were partly justified. Although the bill received judicious support from Archbishop Longley of Canterbury, it was only reluctantly supported by one Evangelical - Charles Baring of Durham - and was opposed by another - Samuel Waldegrave of Carlisle. The first believed the two Churches differed in doctrine and feared hordes of Romish clergy invading the Church of England from Scotland, while the second believed the bill would support "an extreme party" in the Episcopal Church. Even bishops who supported the bill, such as Tait of London, regretted the Scottish Office had not been got rid of by the recent General Synod. [100] Eventually the bill passed the Lords on 16 June. [101] It was introduced into the Commons the next day by Sir William Heathcote, the member for Oxford University. [102] Despite some opposition, Heathcote piloted the bill to a successful conclusion in the Commons on 21 July 1864. [103] It received the royal assent on 29 July 1864. [104]

Forbes gave the news to his brother with the humour he could use between intimates. "Ewing is now eligible for the see of Canterbury. Dr. Rorison for the Mastership of the Temple. The Bp. of Glasgow will immediately be made Court Chaplain with the Deanery of Windsor in commendam; but her Majesty has not yet determined what honour she is to heap on Dr. Alexander."* [105] A more serious appreciation of the act came in his synod address on 3 August 1864. Forbes believed the disabilities had discouraged men of a good social class entering the ministry of the Episcopal Church and he now thought numbers of clergy would increase. He commented on the tolerant attitude of the Church of Scotland towards the bill, which, when he considered the numbers of Episcopalian landowners who financially supported the Church of Scotland, was only to be expected. But Scotland, he feared, was still a country "where there is so much religious prejudice". [106] In October Forbes assured Gladstone that they were beginning to feel the good effects of the measure, but, characteristically, he prayed that "we do not become more secular under the influence of the world's smiles". [107]

His continued admiration for Gladstone had brought about a change in Forbes' political allegiance. Although raised a Tory, Forbes remained loyal to Gladstone when, in the 1860's, the statesman made his way into the Liberal party. In 1864 Frederick Lygon solicited Forbes' vote against Gladstone at the forthcoming Oxford University election. But Forbes said he had been satisfied with the explanations Gladstone had given regarding his position as member for the university and with his loyalty to the "Church Cause", that he trusted Gladstone as a "highsouled man & a Christian", and therefore he did not feel justified in voting

---

* John Alexander, incumbent of St. Columba's, Edinburgh.

against him. [108] In the 1867 election, when Gladstone finally lost the university seat because he had lost the confidence of many Churchmen, Forbes still voted for him, despite disagreeing with Gladstone's support for Jews being admitted to Parliament and his campaign for the laity to be represented in synods of the Episcopal Church. [109] Forbes' willingness to vote for Gladstone as a Liberal was primarily based on Forbes' personal admiration for Gladstone, rather than a fundamental commitment to Liberalism. During the same time as he was supporting Gladstone politically Forbes was defending conservatism, advocating in 1867 the High Church Tory Lord Salisbury for chancellor for Oxford University as a means of retaining the religious tests there. [110]

During the 1860's, and for the most of his life, Forbes devoted his recreation to scholarship. He was elected a fellow of the Scottish Society of Antiquaries in 1870. [111] Principally interested in the history of liturgy and hagiology, his major works in these areas were the edition of the *Arbuthnott Missal* he published with his brother in 1863; his *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, (1872); and his edition of the *Lives of S.Ninian and S.Kentigern* (1874). The Arbuthnott Missal represented the only surviving example of medieval Scottish liturgy, and the editing of it stimulated Forbes' interest in the hagiology of Scotland which reached its climax in his *Kalendars*. In this work Forbes demonstrated a critical use of his sources, although he was inclined to support traditional beliefs about the saints concerned. But certainly by the 1870's Forbes had begun to acknowledge the validity of the modern critical basis of ecclesiastical history, which was the result of the influence of German historiography upon British historians in the later nineteenth century. In 1871 he observed to Gladstone, "I feel increasingly the importance of the historical involvement of Theology, a lesson which we have been too slow in learning from the patient & accurate Germans". [112] It was probably through his friendship with

the German historian Ignaz von Döllinger that Forbes encountered German historical thought. According to this European historiography, the miraculous lay outwith the judgement of history and therefore the history of the Church was considered from a purely natural, rather than supernatural, perspective. The action of God within the Church and the validity of miracles was understood as lying within the province of theology rather than history. So Forbes could write of the place of miracles in historical writing:

> We should not have exhibited the whole case had we suppressed all the miracles which form so great a proportion of the incidents in the lives [of the saints in the *Kalendars*]. Some of these are such as to excite a smile upon the gravest countenance. The nature of this work, being untheological, precludes the necessity of touching on this subject from any other than a literary point of view. Even those who reject them must admit their historic value as illustrations of the domestic life and manners of epochs of which we know so little. [113]

Theologically, Forbes was as attached as ever to the reality of miracles, but he recognized that doubt about them existed among educated men due to the influence of biblical criticism and empirical science. Forbes still endeavoured to claim a place for miracle stories as valuable evidence for what would now be called social history, but he accepted that many such stories were becoming regarded in historical circles as the stuff of humorous legends. As he said in his *Lives of S.Ninian and S.Kentigern*, "a historical work like this is not the place to enlarge on its [St Ninian's life] religious aspect". [114] But his theological resistance to a full acceptance of the critical basis for history is evident in this work also, in his disposition to accept as history all the miracles of S. Martin recorded in a contemporary source. [115] But, for Forbes, history served a higher purpose than merely a critical study of the evidence. His understanding of history was fundamentally romantic and theological, in which the past was seen to be a record of "Providence shaping our ends".

> no one can stand within the precincts of the ruined priory of Whithern[sic], or look out to sea from the roofless chapel at the Isle [of Iona], without

> emotions which are difficult to describe. He stands on a spot where the ancient civilization of Rome, and the more ancient barbarism of the Meatae, alike gave place to the higher training of the gospel of Christ. [116]

Forbes' concern about the influences of contemporary thought upon religious belief had their most public expression in his support for the annual meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science held in Dundee in 1867. Unlike his hostile reaction to biblical criticism in *Essays and Reviews* in 1860, he actively supported this event and did not appear to regard science as having quite the same threatening potential for religion as did criticism of scripture. When Dundee was accepted by the Association for its 1867 meeting a massive campaign of support and organization went on in the city to ensure its success. Civic pride was at stake. The bishop subscribed £3 towards the £4000 considered necessary for a successful show, and various other societies agreed to participate, including the Working Men's Flower Show Society. Forbes became one of the sixty four members of the Local Executive Committee in overall charge of the event. He was also appointed one of the Conversazione Committee, responsible for organizing two "soirees" during the meeting, and to the Local Industries Committee. But he became most involved in a sub-committee, organising an Art and Industry Exhibition in connection with the Association's activities. [117] The influence of Forbes and Lord Kinnaird was regarded as having been crucial in getting the local nobility and gentry to offer their artworks to this grand event. [118] Forbes himself loaned a painting by Samuel Bough, a drawing by Overbeck, and a Limoge enamel of St. Augustine. [119]

Along with the Art and Industry Exhibition Forbes was also concerned about the Sunday services held during the course of the Association's meeting. On 8 September 1867 he preached at St. Paul's in one of the Sunday services advertised

as part of the Association's meeting. Forbes made a high claim for the providential involvement of God in all areas of life and the material universe, otherwise, he declared, humanity was at the mercy of a mechanical universe. Life lost its "moral significance", because the diverse vicissitudes of life were impossible to explain. [120] The union of God with matter in the incarnation of Christ, Forbes asserted, was the basis for involvement of the supernatural in all facets of physical life, including science, the Church, history and individual life. [121]

The British Association meeting was held on 4 to 12 September 1867. Forbes' only other public occasion connected with it occured at the closing ceremony of the art exhibition on 30 September, following the conclusion of the Association's meeting. Then, Forbes was one of the speakers asked to address the public gathering on the relation between art and civilization. His ideas were fairly commonplace aesthetics, upholding art as the highest expression and measure of any civilization. But he upheld the rise of neo-gothic architecture as an expression of medieval principles of "authority and tradition" counter-balancing "the mighty spirit of Democracy" he regarded as predominant in the nineteenth century. [122]

Faced with threats to tradition from new thought, or revived older pressures such as anglicization, during the 1860's Forbes demonstrated a varying degree of flexibility, and, in at least one case, an alteration in his intellectual understanding. He remained fundamentally opposed to biblical criticism, although he believed it needed to be met intellectually and not by the mere exercise of ecclesiastical authority. He refused to endorse a plan to attack the contributors to *Essays and Reviews* through the convocation of Oxford University because it would have given the appearance of persecution. The experience of his trial during the eucharistic controversy had made him more cautious toward institutional authority as a means

of dealing with differing theological positions. However, by 1870, his own historical works reveal he was more amenable towards historical criticism than he had been in 1860. But this applied only in nonbiblical areas, and even in these subjects he retained a disposition to understand history as a record of divine providence. He had yet to understand that historical criticism could not be upheld in fields outside scripture without, eventually, intellectual demand to apply the same techniques to the historical claims of scripture also. Forbes was more positive towards the rise of experimental science, at least in the latter 1860's. At the British Association meeting in 1867 he demonstrated a Victorian enthusiasm for the achievements of science and technology, although he was also keen to defend the reality of the invisible, supernatural realm which he knew numbers of his countrymen had difficulty believing in. But his most inflexible opposition came in a stand against the pressures of anglicization insofar as they posed a threat to the Scottish Communion Office. The demotion of the Scottish Communion Office and the superiority of the *Book of Common Prayer* did represent "the anglicising of Scottish Episcopacy". [123] The weight of the Church of England's power and wealth proved overwhelming to many clergy in the Scottish Episcopal Church, especially as significant numbers of them in the south were English anyway. But it was not only the English who supported anglicization because support for the English prayer book also came from clergy in Scottish orders. Nor was anglicization a desire only of southern Churchmen. Gilbert Rorison of Aberdeen had many sympathisers among the clergy of that diocese in his campaign for the *Book of Common Prayer*. Some Episcopalian clergy wanted to be able to move into the English Church with its greater social advantages. Others believed assimilation to an Established Church gave the Episcopal Church greater legitimacy. Some, like Charles Terrot, hoped to attract Englishmen into the Episcopal ministry. But even supporters of the Scottish Office like Robert Thom thought diversity from England would be difficult to

maintain now that railways and industrialization had brought the two nations closer together, and increased the influence of the larger over the smaller neighbour. Further, the clergy increasingly depended on upper and middle class support for church extension, and these were the Scottish social orders most in favour of anglicization during the nineteenth century. Inevitably, the wealth of these members of congregations made them supporters the clergy were reluctant to antagonise, and whose enthusiasm for uniformity with the Church of England many clergy shared.

However, the prevailing influence of anglicization did encounter some important checks or modifications among Episcopalians. Not all Episcopalians of the middle and upper classes were so enthusiastic about England that they neglected their native traditions. The Earl of Morton, George Boyle, and Forbes himself were among an important minority who believed some Scottish traditions superior to their English counterparts. In a number of instances, like that of Forbes, family background or personal contact with the Scottish Office could engender support for the Scottish Office. So also could contact with Scots Episcopalians of the lower classes in traditional Episcopalian areas of the north east. Nor did cross-cultural influence work only in one direction, from south to north. Robert Eden of Moray is an interesting example of an Englishman who developed an appreciation for Scottish traditions and resented being dictated to by the bishops of the Church of England over the Scottish Office. Probably being bishop of the most northern diocese had a lot to do with his new outlook.

Insofar as Forbes' life provides an illustration of the effect of anglicization within the Episcopal Church, the principal modification to its influence came from his Tractarianism. The Oxford Movement had taught Forbes to appreciate examples of catholicity wherever they were to be found. This meant he valued such signs

more than he did national distinctions. He was also less amenable to the influence of the powerful Church of England because Tractarian theology, and experiences such as the Denison case or his own trial, had convinced him that might was not always right, especially in matters of Catholic truth. Catholic truth, for Forbes, was not necessarily a matter of what the majority believed in the contemporary Church, but was found in those elements of the present-day Church that resembled the patristic Church. One of the most significant of these examples of Catholic truth, according to Forbes, was the Scottish Communion Office. It is true that Tractarianism did not necessarily lead to an appreciation of the Scottish Office - many English Tractarians preferred the *Book of Common Prayer* as being closer to the Roman liturgy - but it did cause Tractarians to value the Catholic Church above nationalism, or uniformity with Established Churches. In this way Tractarianism helped some Scots Episcopalians like Forbes to keep anglicization at a critical distance. As well, by the 1860's, Tractarians had experience of organising in defence of the Catholic faith - against the state (the Gorham case) and even against the Church (the eucharistic controversy). Such experience meant that Forbes was able to provide valuable leadership and recruit influential support for those northern Churchmen who, like Robert Thom, valued the Scottish Office, but were often reluctant to defend it vociferously. Forbes' campaign for the Scottish Communion Office enabled him to recapture some of the support among northern Churchmen he had previously alienated in the eucharistic controversy - men such as his brother George for example. His Tractarianism gave him an appreciation of the Office for its similarity to patristic liturgies, causing him to value it above considerations of closer connection with the Church of England. However, because the pressure on the Scottish Office was also a threat to Forbes' own commitment to the Anglican Church he defended the office with all the resources at his disposal, leading a campaign of opposition to its probable demise that included a

willingness to compromise as well as the use of political muscle. It is an irony that Forbes, fundamentally a religious and political conservative, should have needed the influence of an increasingly Liberal Gladstone to secure the place of the traditional Scottish Communion Office in the Episcopal Church. Forbes' defence of the Scottish Office was his most entrenched defence of tradition, and was principally motivated by his uncertainty about the Catholic nature of the Episcopal Church. That uncertainty made him more appreciative of Roman Catholicism, and brought him, by the time of his synod address in 1863, to a realisation of the importance of Catholic unity. It is therefore necessary to consider Forbes' involvement with other Churches.

NOTES.

1. F.M.C.Skene, *A Memoir of Alexander, Bishop of Brechin*, (1876), 22.
2. I.Ellis, *Seven against Christ*, (1980), 87f.
3. Ibid., 106-108.
4. Ibid., 117.
5. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d., SAUL.19.2.239.
6. G.H.Forbes to A.P.Forbes, 30 August 1860, BrMS.1.2.459.
7. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, 10 November 1860, BrMS.1.7.132.
8. W.Trower to A.P.Forbes, 10 December 1860, BrMS.1.2.497.
9. A.P.Forbes to R.Eden, "Xmas Eve" [24 December]1860, BrMS.1.2.499.
10. Mark Pattison, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750", in *Essays and Reviews*, (6th edn., 1861), 256.
11. A.P.Forbes to R.Eden, 20 February[1862], BrMs.1.3.567.
12. REC.III., 3 October 1861, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 27.
13. Ibid., 18 December 1861, 30.
14. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, March 1857, SAUL.19.2.114.
15. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, March 1857, SAUL.19.2.113.
16. REC.II., 9 November 1859, SRO., CH.12.60.3, 433.
17. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 2 May 1861, PH., KP.iv.
18. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d.[3 May 1861], PH., PK.vi.
19. Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, (1971) part 1, 19.
20. A.P.Forbes to W.S.Wilson, n.d., BrMS.1.3.524.
21. J.B.Sumner to C.H.Terrot (copy), 5 February 1862, BrMS.1.3.561.
22. A.P.Forbes to W.S.Wilson, n.d., BrMS.1.3.561.
23. REC.III., 26 February 1862, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 35-39.
24. C.H.Terrot to A.C.Tait, 27 February 1862, LPL., Tait Papers, v.79, f.271.
25. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 1 March 1862, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.274.
26. W.E.Gladstone to A.P.Forbes, 3 March 1862, BrMS.1.3.572.
27. A.P.Forbes to R.Eden, n.d., BrMS.1.3.575.
28. R.Eden to A.P.Forbes, 6 March[1862], BrMS.1.3.576.
29. W.E.Gladstone to R.Eden, 2 April 1862, Lathbury, vol.1, 435-6.
30. W.S.Wilson to A.P.Forbes, 19 March 1862, BrMS.1.3.585.
31. C.H.Terrot to A.P.Forbes, 20 March[1862], BrMS.1.3.586.
32. W.S.Wilson to A.P.Forbes, 26 March 1862, BrMS.1.3.594.
33. A.P.Forbes to R.Lingard (-Guthrie), 30 April 1865, SPC.
34. R.Eden to A.P.Forbes, 10 April[1862], BrMS.1.3.612.
35. REC.III., 5 July 1862, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 44.
36. C.H.Terrot to A.P.Forbes, 20 March[1862], BrMS.1.3.586.
37. A.Ewing to A.P.Forbes, 21 March 1862, BrMS.1.3.587.
38. A.P.Forbes to A.Ewing, 22 March 1862, BrMS.1.3.587.
39. R.Thom to A.P.Forbes, 22 March 1862, BrMS.1.3.590.
40. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, n.d.[c.27 March 1862], PH. PK.vi.
41. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
42. J.Keble to A.P.Forbes, 1 April 1862, BrMS.1.3.600.
43. W.E.Gladstone to R.Eden, Lathbury, vol.1, 436-7.
44. R.Eden to A.P.Forbes, 9 April[1862], BrMS.1.3.632.
45. A.P.Forbes to R.Eden, n.d., BrMS.1.3.632.
46. W.E.Gladstone to A.Ewing, Lathbury, vol.1, 437-8.
47. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d., SAUL.19.2.303.
48. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, 2 May[1862], BrMS.1.3.613.
49. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.

50. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
51. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 9 May 1862, PH., KP.iv.
52. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 14 May[1861], PH., PK.vi.
53. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
54. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 17 May 1862, PH., KP.iv.
55. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
56. W.E.Gladstone to S.Wilberforce, 28 June 1862, Lathbury, vol.1, 438-9.
57. Ibid., 439.
58. W.E.Gladstone to A.P.Forbes, 5 July 1862, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, ff.278-282.
59. REC.III., 8-16 July 1862, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 55-62.
60. *Proposed Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*", (1862), Unlisted papers in Scottish Record Office, to be added to CH.12.
61. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
62. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 27 August 1862, BrMS.4.1.3., 102-5.
63. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vii.
64. A.P.Forbes to G.Rorison (copy), 11 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.633.
65. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d., SAUL.19.2.306.
66. Earl of Morton to A.P.Forbes, 11 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.634.
67. G.Rorison to A.P.Forbes, 16 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.641.
68. A.P.Forbes to G.Rorison, 18 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.642.
69. G.Rorison to A.P.Forbes, 19 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.643.
70. A.P.Forbes to G.Rorison (copy), 21 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.644.
71. G.Rorison to A.P.Forbes, 23 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.646.
72. W.E.Gladstone to G.Rorison, 30 August 1862, BrMS.1.3.650.
73. G.Rorison to A.P.Forbes, 9 September 1862, BrMS.1.3.657.
74. W.E.Gladstone to A.P.Forbes, 15 September 1862, BrMS.1.3.658.
75. G.Rorison to A.P.Forbes, 25 September 1862, BrMS.1.3.663.
76. R.Eden to A.P.Forbes, 3 September[1862], BrMS.1.3.654.
77. G.F.Boyle to A.P.Forbes, 5 September 1862, BrMS.1.3.655.
78. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
79. REC.III., 30 September to 4 October 1862, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 76-77.
80. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 29 September 1862, PH., PK.vi.
81. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
82. J.Robertson to A.P.Forbes, 28 October 1862, BrMS.1.3.681.
83. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, November 1862, SAUL.19.2.299.
84. J.Robertson to A.P.Forbes, 1 December 1862, BrMS.1.3.684.
85. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, 25 January[1863], PH., PPCUP.5.40.
86. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, "Eve of the Epiphany"[5 January 1863], PH., PK.vi.
87. Bundle of petitions concerning possible abolition or alteration of Scottish Communion Office, 1863. Unlisted papers in Scottish Record Office to be added to CH.12.
88. SEJ., February 1863, 22-30.
89. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, "Synod Room, Thursday"[12 February 1863], PH., Pk.vi.
90. SEJ., February 1863, 30.
91. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, 26 June 1863, PH., PK.vi.
92. See Joseph Louis Perrier, *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century*, (1909).
93. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 5 August 1863, BrMS.4.1.3., 113-116.
94. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 8 February 1864, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.288.
95. SPC., vestry meeting, 23 April 1864.

96. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vi.
97. J.Keble to E.B.Pusey, 14 June 1864, PH., KP.iv.
98. Hansard, vol.175, c.257.
99. REC.III., Account of the passing of the Disabilities Removal Bill by Robert Eden at the Episcopal Synod, 6 October 1864, SRO., CH.12.60.4, 320-330.
100. Hansard, vol.175, c.617-631.
101. Hansard, vol.175, c.1824.
102. Hansard, vol.175, c.1939.
103. Hansard, vol.176, 1408-31; c.1610-11; c.1874-6.
104. 27 & 28 Victoria, Cap.xciv.
105. A.P.Forbes to G.H.Forbes, n.d., SAUL.19.3.163.
106. Brechin Diocese Synod Minutes, 3 August 1864, BrMS.4.1.3., 119-122.
107. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 18 October 1864, BL.44154, f.294.
108. A.P.Forbes to F.Lygon (copy), 12 July 1864, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.291.
109. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 27 May[1867], Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.303.
110. A.R.Ward, *Victorian Oxford*, (1965), 258.
111. *Proceedings of the Scottish Society of Antiquaries*, viii, (1869-70), xxiii.
112. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 19 October 1871, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.316.
113. A.P.Forbes (ed.), *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, (1872), xlv.
114. A.P.Forbes, *Lives of S.Ninian and S.Kentigern*, (1874), x.
115. Ibid., xxxviii.
116. Ibid., lx.
117. *Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Dundee, September 1867*, (1868), vii-xii.
118. Ibid., 51.
119. Ibid., 79 & 86.
120. A.P.Forbes, *Our Lord: The Sufficing Manifestation of the Eternal Father in Nature and In Grace*, (1867), 10.
121. Ibid., 15-16.
122. *Meeting of British Association in Dundee 1867*, Op.Cit., 57-60.
123. Christopher Knight, "The Anglicising of Scottish Episcopacy" in RSCHS, vol.xxiii, part 3, (1989), 361-377.

6

REUNION AND DOUBTS RESOLVED.

On 8 September 1857 a small group of enthusiasts met in the London chambers of the Revd. F.G.Lee to vote into existence the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom. [1] The Association was dedicated to the corporate reunion of the so-called Catholic branches of the Church - Roman, Orthodox and Anglican - and would survive until the 1920's, although its membership was always predominantly Anglican rather than Roman Catholic or Orthodox. In 1865, it was condemned by Rome and Roman Catholics forbidden to join. Although Forbes was not present at the original meeting, he did play a major role in the new initiatives, indeed, the formation of the Association was the consequence of an earlier conversation in July 1857, also in London, between Forbes, the Roman Catholic layman Ambrose Phillips de Lisle, and the ritualist priest F.G.Lee. Forbes' involvement marked the beginning of an intense personal concern for Catholic reunion that would be one of the driving forces of the rest of his life. At various times during the final two decades of his life he would also demonstrate an awareness of the Orthodox Churches and, on one occasion, a passing interest in the high church movement in Denmark. But the central focus of his attention remained reunion with Rome, a concern which reached a climax with the First Vatican Council. His disappointment over the result of that Council caused him to redirect his attention towards the emerging Old Catholic movement, and to

come to a resolution of his doubts about Anglicanism.

Forbes had always been conscious of the Catholic nature of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. In 1858 there had been a possibility that he would go to Russia, taking J.M.Neale as his chaplain, to confirm among the families of the British diplomatic community there. [2] The possibility of a trip to Russia also arose in 1873, but again fell through, probably because of Forbes' uncertain health. [3] He had a mixed attitude to the Orthodox. In 1865 he had translated the Scottish Office into Greek as a contribution towards greater understanding with the Orthodox, and he was prepared to be more positive than Pusey regarding the Orthodox opposition to the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed. [4] In 1866 he told Gladstone he thought the acceptance of the seventh ecumencial council by the Orthodox, sanctioning the veneration of icons, stood in the way of closer relations. [5] But in 1870 he severely criticized the response from Archbishop Tait to a synodical letter from the Greek Church in which Tait said the Church of England did not sanction prayer for the dead. [6] Forbes was committed to recognising the Orthodox Churches as indispensable components of Catholic Christendom, but his experience, and therefore his attention, remained primarily upon the Church in the west.

Despite Forbes' fervent Catholic beliefs and his serious consideration of Roman Catholic conversion, during 1852 he fleetingly became interested in an attempt to Anglicanize the high church movement in the Lutheran Church of Denmark, a movement which had originated through the influence of the Danish theologian Nicolai Grundtvig. Forbes' involvement came about through his friend, the Anglo-Catholic M.P. Alexander Beresford-Hope who, in February 1852, asked his advice about a Danish pastor who was considering episcopal re-ordination.

Beresford-Hope's interest was stimulated by Nugent Wade, vicar of St. Anne's, Soho, who had visited Denmark and been impressed with Grundtvig. Beresford-Hope decided that Anglican links with the high church group in the Danish Church could be established more easily through the Scottish Episcopal Church than through the established Church of England. [7] He was therefore in touch with the Scottish bishops about this prospect during February and March 1852, receiving encouraging replies from both Ewing and Eden. [8] Forbes advised him to secure a Danish deputation to the Episcopal Synod of 1852. [9] Forbes also suggested translating the *Tracts for the Times* into Danish. Wade's zeal had convinced him that the Danish high church movement might be encouraged by an Anglican mission to Denmark that summer led by a Scottish bishop - a position he had in mind for Forbes. [10] But Forbes failed to express any interest in this Anglo-Catholic evangelism to Denmark, despite Beresford-Hope's wish to see Scandinavians being ordained in St.Ninian's, Perth. [11]

Forbes' personal priority was not with the Lutheran Churches, but was rather Anglican reunion with Rome. Following the July meeting with Lee and de Lisle he had written to Lee outlining his position. Excited by the prospects for reunion work engendered by their conversation Forbes nevertheless stressed the need for caution, because he felt it needed only an inopportune phrase to set off the usual British no-popery prejudice. He therefore counselled limiting the objectives to prayer for unity, and submitting to the Roman Curia relevant documents in support of the validity of Anglican orders. But he re-emphasized his belief that less haste, more speed, was the way forward for such an unprecedented step as a public organisation bringing together Anglicans and Roman Catholics dedicated to reunion between their Churches.

With regard to my own immediate part in this business, I feel that I must

> proceed with great caution. The object in view is one that I have prayed for for many years and therefore I am willing both to act and to suffer in the cause - at the same time a false step on my part, may both do the cause harm, and be a scandal to those whose souls are immediately entrusted to me. I shall probably do nothing in public without consulting the Bishop of Moray, Mr Keble and Mr Justice Coleridge. You will, I am sure, see the wisdom of this caution. In a matter of such unexampled moment and difficulty one cannot be too circumspect where one acts officially. [12]

The foundation of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom (APUC) was the work of three men devoted to the cause of Roman Catholic-Anglican reunion. F.G.Lee, although an ardent ritualist was not a follower of the Oxford Movement, having come to a Catholic position independently through his own thinking, which was dominated by aesthetic ritualism and a desire for reunion with Rome. He had moved to London after having been dismissed from Oxford diocese by Samuel Wilberforce in 1856 for ritualism. Eventually, after appointments in London and Aberdeen, Lee became vicar of All Saints, Lambeth in 1867. [13] Ambrose Phillips de Lisle was a wealthy squire who had converted to Roman Catholicism from the Church of England when he was just fifteen. He founded the Cistercian monastery of Mount St. Bernard on his land and, after the foundation of the APUC, the monastery enthusiastically supported their patron by becoming a member of the Association, at which time Forbes and Lee were welcomed as visitors to the abbey. [14] De Lisle was a romantic Tory who believed in established Churches. The Oxford Movement had convinced him that the Church of England was becoming more sympathetic towards Rome but was also forsaking establishment, which threatened to leave the country at the mercy of dissent and revolution. He therefore believed that reunion could save England from disintegration by allying the Church of England with Rome, which would then support establishment. [15] Both Lee and de Lisle were ardent advocates of reunion who brought little discretion to their cause, being temperamentally disinclined to

heed Forbes' more cautious counsel.

Forbes' suggestion about presenting the case for Anglican orders to Rome was briefly taken up. The responsibility for its formulation was given to George Boyle who, in September 1857, sent his work to Forbes for endorsement. Forbes advised that there should be some mention of the Orthodox Church as this would increase the number of those willing to support the plan. [16] But by October Forbes had become cooler towards the proposals about Anglican orders. Boyle observed to Lee that "certain very recent circumstances make him [Forbes] deem it better not to give them the *formal imprimatur* which I solicited". This was clearly a reference to the beginning of the eucharistic controversy in Scotland - a controversy which served to increase Forbes' wariness about the Association. Aware that much of the opposition to his doctrine of the eucharist derived from its similarity to Roman Catholic doctrine, he became understandably reluctant to lend his name to a defence of Anglican ordination to the Vatican. Therefore, on the 19 October Forbes advised adoption of de Lisle's suggestion not to proceed with seeking a formal vindication from Rome, and Forbes' obvious reluctance to proceed caused the abandonment of the project. [17]

Despite the fact that historians who mention the APUC consider Forbes to have been a founder member, he, in fact, never joined the Association. In a letter of welcome to Lee after the latter had accepted the appointment of an Aberdeen congregation in 1859 Forbes said, "You will recollect that tho' generally sympathising I have never enrolled myself as a member". [18] Forbes was initially prepared to be formally connected with the Association. In his letter to Lee following the July meeting it was Forbes who suggested the preparation of a defence to the Curia of Anglican orders. No doubt his experience of the

intemperate enthusiasm of Lee and de Lisle only increased his caution and intensified his decision not to undertake any formal ties with the Association. But it was the intervention of the growing eucharistic controversy in Scotland after September 1857 that caused Forbes to reconsider his involvement with the APUC and the cause of reunion with Rome.

To be sure, the publication of the *Union Newspaper* as the official organ of the Association must have confirmed Forbes in his decision. The paper quickly established itself as the journal of the most pro-Roman elements among Anglicans and alienated conservatives such as Keble, who resigned from the APUC because of it. Alarmed at the tone of the *Union* Forbes wrote to Lee, probably in late 1857, criticising the wholesale endorsement of Roman Catholicism in the paper's early issues.

> The articles against Tractarianism have driven back and alarmed many of your general well-wishers, and those who have hitherto opposed the paper now point triumphantly to these papers as the best vindication of their hostility. Others object to many puerilities which I confess I cannot defend, e.g. though one must admire the grand features of the Roman system, one is not the better for holding up for imitation every little discipline and use. [19]

But Forbes' decision not to join the APUC did not mean he had given up hopes of the corporate reunion of Catholic Christendom, and he maintained many personal links with Roman Catholics. His letter to Lee in 1859 also demonstrates that Forbes maintained a detailed knowledge of contemporary European Roman Catholicism. He asked Lee if he had seen the new periodical edited by Abbé Guettée, *L'Union Chrétienne*, and offered to send Lee the first issue. Guettée was a leading writer of gallican views who was eventually condemned by the French bishops. His journal became influential among pro-reunion circles in England and he actively solicited letters and articles from Anglicans for it. [20] Forbes seems to

have served as a conduit through which Guetée's gallican views became known in Anglican circles. Nor was Guettée the only Roman Catholic connection Forbes had made by the beginning of the 1860's. He was by then a frequent traveller to the continent, especially to France, for the sake of his health. His brother George was a useful source of introductions as he had lived in France for some years in his youth, under the care of a French specialist for his polio. Included among such such contacts was Jean Baptiste Pitra, a patristic scholar and correspondent of George Forbes. Pitra was prior of the new monastery of S. Germain -des-Prés in Paris when Forbes first met him while visiting France in July 1857. [21] Pitra was subsequently made a cardinal in 1861, and became Vatican librarian in 1869. [22]

The eucharistic controversy continued to divert Forbes' attention from plans for reunion during the early 1860's, although he maintained his European contacts through his continental visits. However, the resolution of the controversy and the following campaign over the Scottish Office and the clerical disabilities in 1864 left Forbes more free to turn his attention back to his hopes for corporate reunion. But this time he engaged in more personal discussions, supporting Pusey's dialogue with French Roman Catholic bishops.

Pusey's theology had become more favourable towards Rome as he came to accept the early Church as normative in doctrine and practice. Pusey also rationalised Newman's secession in 1845 as a divine means of bringing the Anglican and Roman Churches closer together, and from that time began to involve himself in work for reunion. He believed that the Church of England had a duty to conform itself to what was held in common by the other two "branches" of the Catholic Church - Roman and Orthodox. This common faith was what constituted Catholic Christianity for Pusey. However, he thought the Anglican Church's first

duty was towards reunion with Rome as the other western Catholic Church. In August 1845, in a letter to Henry Manning, Pusey was already proposing reunion on the basis of the decrees of the Council of Trent. [23] In response to an attack on the Church of England in 1864 by the now-Roman Catholic Manning*, Pusey published in September 1865 *The Church of England, a portion of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church and a means of restoring visible unity. An Eirenicon in a letter to the author of "The Christian Year"*. This was the first of three books published separately but regarded by Pusey as comprising three connected instalments of his *Eirenicon*, his plan for reunion between Rome and the Church of England. It included a vindication of the Catholic teaching of the Thirty Nine Articles using a similar grammatical exegesis to Newman's Tract 90. Pusey also made a distinction between official Roman teaching and popular piety, arguing that many of the objections to Roman Catholicism belonged to the latter area and not to the former. It was on this basis that Pusey began to canvas support for his proposal for reunion.

Forbes wanted him to have the work translated into French and German so as to be read by influential Roman Catholics, and Pusey agreed. He told Gladstone that he and Forbes hoped "to have a hearing with the non-extreme party before the Synod at Rome". [24] This was a reference to the synod of bishops convened by Pope Pius IX on 26 June 1867 for the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of Ss. Peter and Paul, and Pusey's comment illustrates that he and Forbes were working together in considering an approach to the less ultramontane

---

* *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England: a Letter to the Rev.E.B.Pusey, D.D.*, (1864).

Roman Catholic bishops. Pusey implemented this idea by visiting France to present his book personally to some of the French bishops, leaving for the continent on 11 October 1865 and returning to England on 20 October. [25] He considered the trip to have been very satisfactory, singling out especially the "extreme sympathy and largeness of view of the Abp of Paris". He sent a long letter reporting the trip to Forbes which he hoped would be "very encouraging to him". [26] Pusey told Forbes that the archbishop's attitude encouraged him to think that reunion on the basis of an elaboration of the Council of Trent was feasible. The archbishop had proposed a continued correspondence, and recommended Newman as one suitable to frame terms of reconciliation. [27]

Georges Darboy had become Archbishop of Paris in 1863 and his gallican tendencies were strengthened in a controversy with the Vatican over jurisdiction in his diocese. He was an extremely intelligent man, withdrawn in temperament but favourable towards moderate liberalism in France, later becoming a senator. Along with Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans he would lead a minority of the French bishops in their opposition to the decree of papal infallibility at the Vatican Council. Both he and Dupanloup had a rare positive perception of Protestantism (which to them included the Church of England) and were among those who regarded any decree of papal infallibility as inopportune, because it would place a further obstacle in the way of Protestants and Orthodox reuniting with the Roman Catholic Church. [28]

In one of Forbes' few surviving letters to Pusey about their reunion campaign he commented, "You have got more from the ABp of P than I expected you wd get from any R.C. Bishop in view of the terrorism of the Jesuits". But he regretted that Pusey did not engage the archbishop in correspondence so as to have

some written evidence of his position. Pusey characterised Forbes' response as delight over the interview with Darboy. [29] But the evidence for Forbes' views about these French contacts remains slim because not only was most of Forbes' correspondence destroyed after his death, also the majority of Pusey's letters to Forbes were returned to him on the bishop's death and also were probably destroyed.

Pusey made a second trip to France, from 19 December to 18 January 1866, which he believed was "theologically more satisfactory" than the first. [30] Pusey, following Darboy's suggestion that Newman's involvement in the discussions would be useful, contacted his old friend. But Newman was not particularly encouraging, being more aware of the degree of differences between the two Churches than either the optimistic Pusey or the eager Forbes. Pusey wrote to him in March 1867 hoping to get a clear definition of what the Roman Catholic Church officially believed the pope's powers were, as a basis for reunion negotiations. But Newman's reply was disappointing. Writing to Pusey, and to Forbes through him, Newman criticised their search for an official minimum of belief. Using a similar argument to his published reply* to Pusey's *Eirenicon*, Newman dismissed the distinction between declared and popular belief as artificial which would only restrict the doctrinal development of the Church. According to Newman, the two were merely aspects of the one faith of the Church - the one explicit and the other implicit - the latter of which may be required to be declared formally in the future. [31]

* *A Letter to the Rev. E.B.Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon*, (1866).

On 27 March 1866 John Keble died and Forbes and Pusey went to Hursley for the funeral. The end of the correspondence between the two oldest Tractarian leaders also meant the end of their invaluable evidence for Forbes' internal struggles. Thus, insight into Forbes' uncertainties over Roman Catholicism from this point on must be largely derived from more external events.

But Forbes' efforts towards Catholic reunion were interrupted in the following year, because of anxieties about the first Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops due to be held in September 1867. On 25 March 1867 Forbes had replied affirmatively to Archbishop Longley's invitation to the Conference. However, he expressed his regret that the meeting was not to concern itself with any definition of doctrine but would only concentrate on practical issues. [32] The declaration of doctrine by the bishops acting as a pan-Anglican council was favoured by high churchmen as a means of opposing doctrinal liberalism, such as that contained in Bishop Colenso's book on the Pentateuch. But conscious of the opposition to anything resembling a dogmatic council by many English bishops, Longley was determined the meeting would be informal.

Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics were also anxious over the possible involvement in the first Lambeth Conference of the episcopal Church of Sweden, which was Lutheran. Some High Churchmen, with a more positive attitude to the Reformation than was common among the Oxford Movement party, had asked Longley to invite the Swedish Church. [33] Pusey deprecated any such recognition of the validity of the orders of the Swedish Church, in a letter to the *Guardian* on 29 July 1867. He felt that any such recognition of the Swedish Lutheran episcopate would unsettle the confidence of Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics in the catholicity of their own Church - Lutherans being regarded by them as heretical.

[34] A correspondence was engendered in the *Guardian* to which Forbes contributed in support of Pusey. Forbes upheld his argument against the legitimacy of the Swedish episcopal succession by citing the high frequency of illegitimate births in Sweden as proof of the poor spread of the gospel in that country! [35] In a further letter to the *Guardian*, published on 11 September 1867, Forbes claimed the authority of the prayer book for rejecting heresy, and for the command not to "keep company with fornicators", adding that this was "a very difficult task indeed in Stockholm". [36] But the Oxford Movement party need not have worried themselves because the Anglican bishops had their minds preoccupied with Bishop Colenso's book, and nothing was done about the Swedish Church.

Forbes was one of those who wanted the Lambeth Conference to act as a sort of Anglican general council, which would also serve as a final Anglican court of appeal in matters of doctrine. Forbes believed such an Anglican council to be necessary because the present condition of Anglicanism was "not only essentially provisional, but universally perilous". He regarded the era of established Churches as now over, leaving Anglicans the alternative of either rationalism or Catholicism. [37] Nevertheless, he was also worried that if Anglican bishops were invited to the Vatican Council, they might be compromised by something previously defined at the Lambeth Conference. [38] In considering in which direction the Lambeth Conference would take Anglicanism Forbes remained "profoundly anxious" about the theological expertise of the bishops who, he felt, "know so little of precise theology that one cannot tell what they may do", while he was also concerned that there was "no provision for the presence of learned theologians, as there ought to be on such occasions". [39] But Longley's determination not to make the Conference a doctrinal synod triumphed and he thereby secured the attendance of Liberal and Evangelical bishops in the Church of England. In 1867 the move away from the

Conference becoming a doctrinal authority prevented the Anglican Church from committing itself to a statement against Colenso and biblical criticism (desired by the majority of American and colonial bishops) that would have become outdated and untenable a few years later. [40] In the event, Forbes' ill-health prevented his attendance at the Conference in London. [41]

Throughout 1867 Forbes was engaged on his major theological work, *An Explanation of the Thirty Nine Articles*. It was his primary contribution to Pusey's campaign for reunion. The intention of the work was to provide a Catholic interpretation of the standard Anglican theological formularies in the light of the forthcoming Vatican Council formally announced by Pius IX on 26 June 1867, but anticipated for some time before that. It followed the lines of Tract 90, and Pusey gave Forbes unstinting assistance in researching patristic sources and even in writing whole sections. [42] The book also gave Forbes an opportunity to acknowledge his debt of discipleship to Pusey. In a dedicatory letter to Pusey at the beginning of the book he wrote:

> This enables me to express, in however inadequate terms, the veneration in which I hold you; and to acknowledge the deep debt of gratitude which I owe you, for the many benefits which you have bestowed upon me, during a friendship which has lasted for more than twenty years, and which has been one of my greatest earthly blessings. To have been trained in your school of thought has been the best discipline for the discharge of the onerous duties of the Episcopate. [43]

But Pusey was concerned that Forbes would be overly biased toward Roman Catholicism, using only Roman books and "meagre on anything but the Roman side". [44] He remarked to his son Philip that Forbes was "specially sensitive" on the subject of the Primacy of Peter. [45] This indicates that Forbes was still attracted to the Roman Catholic claims when he wrote the book.

The book was Forbes' theological *magnum opus* and it included many of his favourite themes. He proposed to offer a presentation of the "positive doctrines" of the Anglican Church by supplying an "accurate theology" because he believed the "want of clear-headedness and precision" in contemporary theology contributed to the present imperfect understanding of Christian truth and thus to doubt and disbelief. [46] He therefore continued to make wholesale use of the specific categories of scholastic philosophy. More understanding of historical criticism of scripture than he had been in earlier in the 1860's, he now accepted that the historical truth of what the Church asserted "must be submitted to the severest historical criticism". However, he remained overly-confident, even blinkered, about its effects on traditional exegesis, asserting historical criticism had failed to find in the gospels any "contradiction such as can destroy their historic worth". [47] Forbes continued to assert traditional Catholic teaching that the Bible was the inspired product of the inspired Church and, accordingly, required to be authoritatively interpreted by the Church. [48] Forbes remained unconcerned about the effects of historical criticism because of his understanding of revelation. He considered it was fundamentally impossible for God to transmit mistaken or imperfect information and therefore Forbes laid before his readers a stark and simplistic choice - "either the Bible must be true in every respect, or not the word of God at all". [49] The communication of these inspired truths Forbes left entirely to the clerical hierarchy, as compromising the teaching Church. [50] Essentially this meant the diocesan bishops, each the equal of the other as the direct successors of the apostles. [51] Forbes continued to oppose theological liberalism because it provided the basis for the abnegation of all revealed dogmatic truth. [52] To undermine revealed truth, authoritatively encapsulated in the dogma of the Church, was also to undermine the basis of morality. Like all the Tractarians, Forbes retained his belief in the essential connection between the teaching of the Church and moral life.

> In the present day there is a great jealousy of the principle of dogma. It is imagined that a true Christian morality, a holy Christian sentiment can exist without it; that Creeds, professing to give us very definite statements on supernatural subjects, are by the very imperfection of language and thought, only trammels to the soul, which is thereby kept from aspiring to the indefinite. Yet this is unreasonable, for there can be no Christian morals without Christian definite faith. Dogma is to morals as cause to effect, will to motion. Christian morality is dogma in action, or practical faith. Indeed, to make men receive and practice a morality severe and painful to human nature, one must give great and positive reasons for so doing: when the morality is superhuman, the motives must be also. Virtues imply beliefs. Nay more, the very fact of Christian morality and its realization in the world implies a set of dogmas at its back, perfect like unto itself. [53]

But his greater caution since the heady days of 1857 was revealed on the topic of the worship of Christ in the eucharist. He claimed it was "unnecessary" to go into this question since the "exhaustive" treatment of the subject by Keble, and he simply referred the reader to Keble's *On Eucharistical Adoration* of 1857. [54] But he continued to criticise virtualism, and endeavoured to explain transubstantiation as simply being the means by which the Roman Church explained with greater definition the words of Jesus at the last supper. [55]

Forbes established the basis for his Catholic interpretation by claiming that to understand the Articles correctly it was necessary to remember the "organic unity of the Church of England before and after the Reformation". Using this historiography Forbes felt free to assert the similarity of the teaching of the Articles with Roman Catholic doctrine. His concern to promote reunion as a Christian defence against infidelity and secularization was plain in his final words in the preface; while his limiting the Catholic Church to the Romans, Orthodox and Anglicans (usual among Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics) was evident in his description of the Protestant Churches as "bodies" rather than as Churches.

> Lastly, convinced that a divided Christendom will not be able to stand the assaults of infidelity, as a house divided against itself cannot stand, I therefore, in all that I have written, have had in view the future reunion of the Church. Recognising the providential position of the Anglican Church, as stretching forth one hand to the Protestant bodies, and the other to the Latin

> and Greek Churches, I have tried to do justice to that position...The basis of reunion must be on what is ruled as *de fide*, and of this nothing is assumed as such, but the contrary of what is published under anathema. This reduces the difficulty, and leaves a wide margin for negociation and explanation. [56]

Forbes was adopting Pusey's distinction between official and popular belief, hoping there could be the basis for reunion negotiations on the foundation of the former rather than the latter. However, conscious of the impending Council at the Vatican, Forbes spent some time addressing infallibility and the papacy. Inerrancy, he maintained, was not the gift of any individual Church, but belonged to the whole Church. Therefore, until the Orthodox Churches were reunited with the west this faculty was in suspension. In the meantime the Church may witness to truth previously declared but was not in the position to sanction new dogma. "While the schism lasts, we must be content with this." [57] The proper vehicle for an infallible declaration of dogma was an ecumenical council of a reunited Church, but even then the test of infallibility would not be the claims of any council itself but its universal reception by the faithful. [58] At the conclusion of the book Forbes asked what was to be done about growing unbelief and secularization. He believed they could be addressed by a general council, and the only power able to convene such a council was the papacy. He therefore made an eloquent plea for a more ecumenical attitude and role on the part of the pope and the forthcoming Vatican Council.

> Let the successor of St. Peter...only rise above the miserable triumph of an immediate Ultramontane success...[and be] the principle of reunion in Christendom. Let him send forth his invitation, not merely to all the Bishops of his own subjection...but let him invite first his own to testify to tradition and to judge freely in matters submitted to him. Then let him invite the ancient Eastern hierarchies...Let him summon the Anglican prelates, not prejudging the doubts of their jurisdiction, but accepting them as they are historically, the occupants of the chairs of St. Austin and St. Paulinus. Let him call to himself all that is still sound in the Lutheran and Calvinist bodies...so shall the great cause of reunion be promoted. [59]

Such a plea, given the character and experience of Pius IX, was always bound to fall upon deaf ears. Pio Nino had become pope in 1846 with a reputation as a liberal and amidst great expectation among Italians that he would support the cause of the unification of Italy. But the revolutions of 1848, which caused the pope to flee for his life from Rome, provoked a reaction in Pius' attempt to place himself at the leadership of European liberalism. His experience in the tumult of 1848 convinced Pius that in liberalism, popular sovereignty and human reason combined to threaten the faith of the Church. Henceforth, he regarded the maintenance of his temporal power as the security for his spiritual independence and turned his back on liberalism in politics and in the Church. By 1860 Pius IX regarded the Italian *Risorgimento* and its liberal principles as based on the atheistic principles of the French Revolution and consequently as the enemy of the Church. Therefore, under his leadership the Roman Catholic Church was placed on the defensive against what was perceived as the threat from modern thought and politics. This attitude was reflected in the introduction of the Syllabus of Errors in 1864. It was unlikely that such a reactionary pope, committed to the defence and assertion of the Roman Church, would have been prepared to countenance the sort of ecumenical role Forbes requested of him.

An indication that Forbes' book was less than likely to have the impact he desired in Roman Catholic circles came in Newman's response to the copy Forbes sent him. In April 1868 Newman said he thought Forbes' reduction of the anti-Roman aspect of the Thirty Nine Articles would only increase the demand for their abolition as a theological standard. Nor was he overly optimistic about the book attracting the attention of Roman Catholic theologians, although he expressed the polite hope that it would. [60] He did receive a more enthusiastic response from the German historian Ignaz von Döllinger who considered it was "the best and

certainly the most Catholic commentary" on the Articles. Like Newman, Döllinger also thought such an interpretation of the Articles would lead to the reduction of their role as a theological standard for Anglican clergy, but imagined this would leave the clergy freer to adopt theological views more favourable to future reunion. Döllinger mentioned his concern about the influence of the ultramontane party at Rome as prejudicial to Forbes' hopes for the Vatican Council, but hoped that "a small but resolute knot of Bishops" would be able to oppose the ultramontanists. [61] Döllinger was a Roman Catholic priest and professor of church history at the University of Munich who had broken away from a previous ultramontanist position under the influence of his historical research. By 1868 Döllinger had developed an intense dislike for what he considered was the historically-unjustified autocracy of the papacy, "behind which lurked his Germanic contempt for all things Roman or Italian". [62] Forbes had visited Döllinger in Munich in 1863 and a friendship of mutual respect had developed. Forbes became one of Döllinger's primary sources of information concerning English developments and religious views, which he greatly admired since his visit to Oxford in 1836. His British sympathies, and friendship with men like Lord Acton and Gladstone, had converted Döllinger to a Whig view of history, in which he sided with the liberals. [63] Döllinger's hostility to Rome was increased when he was not invited to Rome to take part in the preparatory commissions for the Vatican Council. This slight increased the intensity of his arguments against infallibility and in favour of independent national Churches. [64]

At the beginning of 1868 Forbes travelled to Italy to canvas the prospects for reunion in the light of the approaching Vatican Council, and to make various presentations of his book. He took with him a letter of introduction from Pusey to Archbishop Darboy and, visiting the archbishop in February 1868, found him affectionate and friendly towards the Catholic revival in the Chu rch of England.

Darboy also gave him a letter of introduction to the French ambassador in Rome as a means of gaining a papal audience. Forbes was anxious because he would not go to Rome as any sort of official representative. The archbishop, however, thought this informality the safest basis for any negotiations as failure would not leave anyone compromised. Forbes was further troubled by Anglican incohesiveness and diversity of doctrine. [65] It was this lack of doctrinal authority in Anglicanism that Forbes thought a major contributor to contemporary difficulties of faith, and that the restoration of a greater standard of ecclesiastical authority, resulting from reunion with Rome, would prevent the Anglican Church being criticised by the sceptical for lack of doctrinal definition.

Forbes' visit to Rome in 1868 was not his first visit to Italy. He had made the trip for reasons of health on a number of occasions in past years and had developed especially close relations with the monks of the Benedictine abbey of Monte Cassino, to whom he had been introduced by Gladstone. [66] In 1865 he had spent a "delightful" week at the monastery before going on to Munich to see Döllinger. [67] His experiences among the Benedictines had stirred him deeply. [68] He told the monks he would retain "the happiest memories of this visit & the infinite courtesy received" throughout his life and, in a burst of romantic medievalism, he prayed, "may the Venerable House of Monte Cassino thrive for long as the true Sinai of the Middle Ages". [69] In February 1866, acknowledging the copy of one of Forbes' devotional works, one of the monks remarked, "We are troubled a little by the fear of the imminent general suppression of the monasteries". [70]

The unification of Italy, proclaimed in 1861, had brought into sharp relief the conflict between Pius IX's distrust of liberalism and the new Italian government.

Unwilling to take Rome from the papacy by force the capital of the new Italian state was established in Florence. In 1865, a new civil law code was passed which included suppression of various religious institutions. The money raised from the sale of suppressed institutions was then used to increase the stipends of poor clergy. But underlying the apparent utilitarianism of the law was an anti-Catholicism, which was strengthened by the papacy's hostility to the liberal state. [71] This hostility was compounded by the pope's refusal to recognise the Italian government because of Pius' antagonism to the loss of his papal states which had been annexed by the new Italian state. Papal control of Rome and its vestigial territories was only maintained by a French army of occupation under Napoleon III which remained in place until the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870.

Forbes became active in the attempt to save Monte Cassino from secularization. Knowing of his friendship with Gladstone, who was influential with the Italian government, the monks of Monte Cassino, endeavoured to cultivate Forbes' support. In March 1866, when he was about to leave for another trip to Italy, Forbes had approached Gladstone about the campaign to save Monte Cassino. Gladstone had already told him that, as a member of the British government, he could not act publicly, but that he was prepared to act in his private capacity. Therefore, Forbes offered himself as a messenger for any correspondence Gladstone might care to send the monastery. [72] Forbes visited the abbey that April but his stay was cut short by ill-health. One of the monks kept him informed of subsequent developments, acknowledging the support of "kind and distinguished friends in England, who exert themselves in our behalf" although the abbot now believed the monastery would be suspended eventually. [73] On 11 April 1866 a flattering article by Forbes about his visit to Monte Cassino the previous April appeared in the *Guardian*. It was designed to elicit public sympathy for the monastery.

Forbes stressed its continuous history and its contribution to European civilization and scholarship, as well as the warmth and reasonableness of its occupants. [74] In June his Benedictine correspondent informed Forbes that the law of suppression of monasteries, including Monte Cassino, had been passed in the Chamber of Deputies and only required to be passed by the Senate and receive the royal assent. While the monk did not think that a proposed petition from leading British universities and other academic bodies could be prepared before the Italian legislation was passed, he did feel that if it could be sent in time such a petition could possibly prevent them from being evicted from the monastery. [75]

The Italian government secularized it, along with other religious houses, in 1866, and it eventually became a national monument with the monks as its guardians. Forbes maintained his contacts with Monte Cassino for the rest of his life. In May 1867 one of the community was in Florence for talks with the government and he called on Forbes who was in Rome at the time. [76] In June 1868 one of the monks told Forbes about the progress on a facsimile of an antique chest in the monastery that was being made for Forbes as a gift. [77] Later that same year, in August 1868, there was a letter from Monte Cassino acknowledging some choral music Forbes had sent them along with his *Guardian* article and his book on the Articles. The monk who wrote said they still knew nothing of the conditions the government wished to impose on their remaining in the abbey. [78] The last letter of Forbes' concerning Monte Cassino was written in 1873 when he approached Gladstone about using the diplomatic bag to send copies of his *Kalendars of Scottish Saints* to the monastery and to Döllinger. [79]

Therefore, when Forbes went to Rome in 1868 in pursuit of the campaign for reunion he was neither unfamiliar with the city nor without his contacts in the

Italian Church. Forbes went with offers from Bishop Dupanloup to take Pusey's propositions about reunion to Rome himself, and from Archbishop Darboy to send such propositions to Rome in his own name. But despite this encouragement from the French bishops Forbes met with disappointment. In newly unified Italy, with a secularizing government and only French troops preventing Rome from being incorporated into greater Italy, the Church was defensive. In reaction to the secularism of the Italian government even his Benedictine friends had become ultramontanes. Few Churchmen in Italy were disposed to relax the Church's defences and Forbes was met with demands for his own submission as the sole response to his request for the consideration of Pusey's reunion proposals. Forbes therefore chose not to take the preparation of theological propositions any further and persuaded Pusey accordingly. [80]

Newman was not surprised at Forbes' reception when Pusey notified him of it in May 1868. As Newman observed, "the central authority cannot *profess* to relax". He believed Forbes and Pusey should have approached the English Roman Catholic bishops before Forbes went to Rome. But even then Newman would not have expected anything to come of it because of the predominance of the ultramontanists, led by Manning, in the Roman Catholic Church in England. Rome, said Newman, would make concessions on the application only of representative bodies, and not of individuals.

> The Bishop of Brechin, represented nothing tangible. He did now[sic] show a list of Anglican Bishops, "Lordi", Members of Parliament, country gentlemen, farmers and labourers, who, he could pledge himself, would one and all sign the Creed of Pope Pius and hold the later decisions of Rome including the Immaculate Conception, on condition they might hold an Ecumenical Council was the one and only seat of Infallibility. [81]

Newman explained that only the expectation of a large body seeking reconciliation would cause the Roman authorities to moderate the normal requirements of

submission. Newman, in short, could offer little encouragement to Pusey and Forbes in the present conditions prevailing at Rome and in England.

By the end of 1868 Forbes' hopes for an ecumenical initiative at the Vatican Council were fading. In a letter to Döllinger, probably written in late 1868, he revealed his increasing distrust of ultramontanism.

> I need not say how profoundly anxious we are about the coming Roman Council. Many of us who have practically to choose between Anglicanism and Ultramontanism (for secessions in this country amount to this) were in hopes that the questions at issue between the Churches would be submitted to careful analysis and that as a result the way would be made clear to us. As it is, it all seems to point to a stereotyping of the present dominant notions and to an aggravation of the consequences of the fatal divorce between Historic Truth and Dogma, to m y mind one of the most dangerous conditions of these Times. [82]

History, according to Forbes, demonstrated that the papacy had not always professed or exercised the infallibility claimed by the ultramontanists and therefore any dogmatic definition of papal infallibility had to ignore the facts of history. Forbes held no truck with the idea of doctrinal development which allowed Newman and others to accept both the facts of the Church's past and the definition of new dogma. He had hoped the Vatican Council would be more conciliatory to the Anglican position, and be reluctant to proclaim new doctrine if Anglican negotiations were demonstrably serious. If this happened then he, and presumably those others he described as having "practically to choose between Anglicanism and Ultramontanism", would have had the knowledge that Anglican claims had been examined thoroughly by an ecumenical council. If these claims were then found wanting Forbes and the like-minded would have been able to secede from the Anglican Church in good conscience.

If this letter to Döllinger was written in late 1868 then Forbes had good reason for his pessimism about the Vatican Council. By September 1868 the Pope

had issued an invitation to the Orthodox bishops to attend the Council. Anglicans, however, were presumed to have been included in his encyclical of 13 September 1868 addressed to "*Omnibus Protestantibus aliisque Acatholicis*" inviting them to join the one fold. [83] Pusey thought this encyclical indicated that Rome had "prejudged" Anglican orders as invalid. [84] It would also have been disheartening to Pusey and Forbes not to have Anglicans acknowledged by the papacy as part of Catholic Christendom, and unbearable to have been lumped with Protestants. By dismissing their most cherished desire for the Anglican Church to be regarded as a branch of the Catholic Church the encyclical demonstrated that Anglicans were unlikely to receive any conciliation from the Vatican.

But Pusey and Forbes could still cling to the hope that the Council itself would bring forth other, more ecumenical voices. This hope received encouragement when, in January 1869, Forbes began a secret correspondence with the Belgian Jesuit Victor de Buck who had favourably reviewed the first part of Pusey's *Eirenicon* in the journal *Etudes religieuses, historiques et littéraires* in March 1866. [85] De Buck was a Bollandist, a group dedicated to the critical study of hagiology, and his studies inclined him to more liberal sympathies than were usual among his ultramontanist order. He was also a friend of such leading liberal Roman Catholics as Dupanloup. In 1864 de Buck had written a pamphlet reconciling the liberal Belgian constitution with Catholic principles. These mild liberal inclinations and his natural optimism had led de Buck to take an early interest in the Oxford Movement and in 1854 he published a sympathetic article on Anglicanism. [86] However, his liberal views, historical criticism, Anglican sympathies and inopportune expression in writing about popular piety brought him into disfavour at Rome. By 1865 the suspicion he was under in Rome meant that de Buck could not allow his name to be associated publicly with the cause of Anglican reunion. He did,

nevertheless, continue to correspond with a number of English contacts favourable towards Anglican-Roman Catholic reunion, including Richard Simpson, a liberal Roman convert who was sanguine about reunion with the Anglo-Catholics, and Richard Littledale, a ritualist priest and writer, who was a friend of Forbes. [87]

De Buck had known of Forbes' prominence among Anglo-Catholic circles from these and other contacts in England but did not make direct contact with the bishop until the beginning of 1869. In early January 1869, responding to a letter from John Stuart*, written on 29 December 1868, about Forbes' research for his prospective *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, De Buck offered Forbes his assistance in his research. [88] On 19 January 1869 the Belgian wrote another letter to Stuart, intended to be also seen by Forbes, which this time related to reunion matters. In it he mentioned for the first time an argument he would later use repeatedly with Forbes - that if Anglican bishops regarded themselves as Catholics they were bound to come to the Vatican Council. Their presence in Rome, de Buck believed, would lead directly to a debate about the validity of Anglican orders and other matters of doctrinal dispute, which would be easily resolved. De Buck also mentioned that he would be present at the Council as the personal theologian of the Jesuit superior general. [89] Forbes now wrote directly to de Buck, sending him a copy of his book on the Thirty Nine Articles as an illustration of the position of Anglican reunionists. Forbes drew attention particularly to the parts of the book on the validity of Anglican orders. He implied that Roman doubts about Anglican orders were detrimental to the cause

---

* John Stuart was a friend of Forbes from a nonjuring Episcopalian family in Aberdeenshire. He was interested in reunion, and he and de Buck had corresponded on hagiographical and reunion matters since 1866. [Jurich, 381.]

of reunion, in part because of the influence of the Anglican clergy in English society. [90]

In a letter which has not survived except as an incomplete draft among de Buck's papers, the Jesuit wrote in early February, endorsing Forbes' call for an ecumenical council to forward reunion. [91] Forbes' reply on 24 February indicated the continuing strength of his attachment to Anglicanism. Despite his uncertainties, he fastened on the devoted lives of many he knew, and on the response of people to the Catholic revival - which seemed to him signs that divine grace was within the Anglican Church. Forbes was not prepared to reveal his own anxieties about his Church to the Jesuit and preferred to emphasize Anglican strengths. Remarking on the irony of this correspondence between a Jesuit and a representative of his Society's oldest foes Forbes continued:

> Your tradition therefore must be hostile to us [the English Church], whereas we who have been brought up within the pale of Anglicanism, (while we do not fail to confess & deplore many grievous blots & scandals, yet) have brought home to our convictions in many wonderful ways that Christ is indeed within her. You cannot know the beautiful lives of many who profess her tenets. The strong virile piety of her men, the unspeakable purity of her women. So good are they that if their lives are not the fruit of the grace of the sacraments, the natural conclusion is, that people can do very well without sacramental grace at all. Then think of the later movement - the thousands of churches built & endowed by private munificence - the development of the religious life, and the high standard of attainment of the younger clergy. [92]

Meanwhile, Bishop Dupanloup was encouraging de Buck to endeavour to attract Anglicans to the Vatican Council. [93] Presumably, Dupanloup hoped that the presence of Anglicans in Rome would impress others there with the possibility of reunion. This, in turn, might convince the Council that the definition of papal infallibility would be inopportune at that time. Accordingly, de Buck wrote Forbes an extremely long letter on 8 March 1869 attempting to convince him to attend the Council with Pusey as his theologian, regardless of any formal invitation. De Buck

was flattering about the degree to which the Oxford Movement had moved the Anglican Church towards an understanding with Rome, and about Forbes' personal Catholicism. "You are much more Catholic than you think", he assured Forbes, and promised him an honourable reception if he or Pusey came to the Council, again suggesting dogmatic differences could be resolved without too much difficulty. De Buck begged him to seize the historic opportunity for reunion presented by the Council. "Never will there be an occasion like the Council for realizing this end. You, a Scotch Bishop are more free than any other. You have expressed more than any other the desire for the union...More than any other you are bound to go to the Vatican Council." He again tried to convince Forbes that he was in fact included in the papal invitation to all Catholic bishops, citing the example of an Orthodox archbishop who attended the Council of Trent unannounced and was admitted. All Forbes would be asked to do, claimed de Buck, was to profess the creed of Pope Pius*. If Forbes came de Buck was convinced others would follow and reunion could proceed on the basis of an elaborated creed of Pius. But if Forbes could not come, then de Buck hoped to secure another indication of Anglican desire for reunion by proposing that Forbes prepare a paper giving a positive summary of Anglican doctrine which the Jesuit undertook to communicate to Rome. [94] The characteristic optimism of the Belgian, or his comparative isolation from Britain and Rome (for he hardly ever left Belgium in his life), caused him to play down, or perhaps to fail to realise, that English Jesuits and

---

* This was published by Pius IV in 1564 and was imposed on all holders of major ecclesistical office in the Roman Catholic Church. It contained a summary of the doctrines promulgated at the Council of Trent including the relation of scripture and tradition, original sin and justification, the mass, the seven sacraments, the saints, indulgences, and the primacy of the Roman see. [*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed.F.L.Cross & E.A.Livingstone, (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1974), 358.]

other ultramontanists in Rome were generally unwilling to countenance anything beyond individual submissions to Rome, lest corporate reunion negotiations concede too much.

In his reply to de Buck, on 13 March 1869, Forbes protested against a common accusation that he and other leaders of the Catholic revival met from Roman Catholic clerics - namely, that it was the wealth of their livings that kept them within the Anglican Church. For his part, Forbes observed that his private fortune brought him "very much" more than his stipend, and that he remained an Anglican because of "the love I bear to my Flock" and the dread he had of destroying his work among them. [95]

It was up to Pusey to inject a bit of practical reality into de Buck's overly-optimistic outlook on the consequences of an Anglican presence at the Vatican Council. He pointed out to Forbes that subscription to the creed of Pius IV would be taken by many Anglicans to mean Forbes had ceased to be an Anglican, and had vacated the see of Brechin. Pusey instead proposed that an appeal to the Council by Forbes could be effected more satisfactorily by sending a theological defence than by appearing in person at Rome. He reminded Forbes that their object was not simply individual reconciliation but reunion between Churches, and that Anglicans would require some time before they became sympathetic to reunion. Pusey suspected that de Buck's purpose was not so much reunion as to overwhelm any Anglicans who went to Rome with the scale and grandeur of the Roman episcopate, thereby causing their submission. "You are impulsive", Pusey concluded sharply, "and I should think that he did not miscalculate about you". [96] Pusey's impatience with Forbes' overeagerness to trust de Buck's proposals was manifest in his comments to Liddon that Forbes "harps always upon that string `we

represent no one' or `a handful'. I say we represent a large number, but we cannot tell whom we represent until we have definite papers formalised by us, accepted by them". [97] The differences in Pusey's and Forbes' assessments of how much support they had for their reunion plans indicated a difference in their respective perceptions of Anglicanism. Forbes continued to be uncertain about the Anglican position and keen to resolve this by a submission to an appropriate Catholic authority. He was therefore more inclined to trust de Buck's sincere, but optimistic, representation of the reunion position in Rome. Pusey, whose Anglicanism remained unshakeable, was less concerned about the official nature of their approach to Rome and more inclined to scepticism about de Buck's motives. While Pusey probably misunderstood de Buck's motives, his close friendship with Forbes meant he was only too familiar with Forbes' precipitate desire for reunion to become a reality.

This dose of ecclesiastical realism from his oldest and most trusted adviser prompted Forbes to write again to de Buck on 10 April 1869. He now backed off from attending the Vatican Council and injected a more cautious tone into his correspondence by outlining some of the problems he thought Anglicans had with Roman Catholicism. Forbes believed there was an uncompromising attitude on both sides, and said he could in no way construe the invitation to the Council as including either himself or the Anglican bishops. If he came as an individual bishop he feared he would expose himself to recriminations on the part of his own "protestant-minded laity". All he would represent would be the "Unionist School of thought" in the Anglican Church, and as this was neither a cohesive nor formal group, it could hardly be a satisfactory group for the Roman authorities. He concluded that formal theological propositions were the way forward for the reunion movement and he would endeavour to present these, using the good offices of

Dupanloup. Among the aspects of Roman Catholicism difficult for Anglicans Forbes specified compulsory confession, Marian devotions and dogmas, the denial of the chalice to the laity, and the veneration of the cross. In any reunion, he observed, Anglicans would need guarantees from Rome that they would be permitted to proceed along their more "sober way" in doctrine and liturgy. Referring to the issue of doctrinal development Forbes added: "I suppose our standing point must be that Christianity is ever regarded as...a definite depositum once for all bestowed, not a philosophy capable of infinite elucidation and varying in its essential forms according to the action of the human spirit." [98]

On 19 April de Buck hastened to assure Forbes that, far from an hardline attitude predominating among Roman Catholics, counsels of reconciliation were prevalent in many European Roman Catholic minds, as opposed to those in England. He asserted further that reconciliation with "the High Church of England" was one of the motivations of the Vatican Council and that in the deliberations prior to the meeting of the Council "no person has had more influence with the pope...than Mgr. Dupanloup". This was unlikely as the central concern of Dupanloup's life - the continuing relationship between the Church and modern society - was diametrically opposed to that of the Pope, and, once the Council began, Dupanloup quickly became the spokesman for the opposition French minority bishops. [99] In fact, at the Council Dupanloup very promptly distanced himself from papal desires for a decree of infallibility, declaring on 11 December 1869 that it was inopportune. [100] De Buck again asked Forbes to understand himself as included in the papal invitation if he was indeed a Catholic bishop, and urged him to disregard anti-papal protests and do his duty, even if this meant a sort of martyrdom. Regarding Forbes' claim that he would represent no one if he came to the Council, de Buck said that as a diocesan bishop he would be on the same

standing as the other Council Fathers. But if Forbes declined to come, de Buck asked if he could use his influence to ensure that "a respectable number of Doctors authorized by the English Church Union" attended. De Buck went on to answer most of Forbes' concerns on doctrine and liturgy, arguing that the Marian cultus could be toned down by restrictions and there would be no intention by Rome to turn reunited Anglicans into Spanish or Italian Catholics. [101]

Pusey, who Forbes kept informed about his correspondence with de Buck, remained unsatisfied with the Jesuit's suggestions. On 3 May Pusey assured Forbes that the submission of a theological defence could only be a beginning and they would still have to inculcate Anglican sympathy for reunion. For this they would require authoritative statements from Rome on the contentious subjects. Dissatisfied with de Buck's position on Anglican orders and with his urging of conditional re-ordination, Pusey said he preferred to wait until such time as they could receive "more consideration" from Rome. [102]

Pusey's attitude finally convinced Forbes he could not go to the Vatican Council. On 5 May 1869 he wrote de Buck to say he felt "more and more hopeless about any *immediate* fruit as to reunion" coming from the Council, as he could not discern any readiness on either side to take genuine steps towards reunion. Had the terms of the Council accorded with those expressed in his *Explanation of the Thirty Nine Articles* Forbes would have felt bound to go, even at the risk of losing his see. But as they did not he decided he could not go to Rome because to do so would be to sever his communion with Anglicanism.

> As it is, I am morally free to act as I think right, and at this moment I do not see how I should be able to appear without breaking with those with whom I am in Communion. To sign the Creed of Pope Pius even with explanations would be virtually to renounce Communion with England - for this reason signature of that Creed has always been the type of individual

> submission. I should not, believe me, fear the protestant howl, but I have to consider the many tender and holy souls committed to me, who would be scandalized by the act. [103]

Forbes therefore intended to proceed by way of the theological propositions. It appears that this letter of 5 May was not sent at that time because, on 20 May, he added a postscript expressing the "greatest alarm" over the possibility of a definition of papal infallibility at the Council. This, he feared, would bring an end to hopes for reunion between the high church party and Rome. "The English High Church party", Forbes stressed, "have been so trained to believe in Tradition, and to appeal to the Early Church, that they look upon this doctrine with the utmost dislike." Advised again by de Buck, in a letter of 15 May, that he was going to the Council as the personal theologian to his general, Forbes declined de Buck's offer of acting as a channel of communication to Rome, believing this was best left in the hands of Pusey and Dupanloup. [104]

This letter indicates that by 20 May 1869 Forbes had finally resolved his uncertainties, insofar as remaining within the Anglican Church went. His theology, like that of other high churchmen, was rooted in the normative standard of the early Church. He therefore could not ultimately countenance what he regarded as unjustified innovations to the criterion of patristic worship and doctrine. Forbes remained unhappy with much of Marian cultus of the Roman Church which had developed after the patristic era, and found the dogmatic definitions of the immaculate conception of Mary (1854) or the impending promulgation of papal infallibility even harder to stomach. He could not bring himself to accept the theory of doctrinal development, nor could he believe that these later dogmas formed part of the original deposit of the faith. Theological objections aside, Forbes was also constrained, as always, by his pastoral responsibility to his congregation and diocese. He felt bound to reject a step (secession) that his people

would find so objectionable as to constitute a threat to their continuing in the faith. By 1869 Forbes' search for a basis of doctrinal authority had been subsumed under the wider hope of corporate reunion. He was therefore no longer interested merely in resolving his personal need for a Catholic authority - he now desired a corporate reunion of Catholic Christendom as a bastion against doubt and disbelief. But his own uncertainty had made him too eager to trust de Buck and uncritical about the Jesuit's over-optimistic presentation of the desire for reunion within Rome. It was his friendship with Pusey which kept Forbes in touch with a more critical viewpoint. Pusey's greater pessimism in 1869 regarding the reunion aspirations of the papacy and the Vatican Council convinced Forbes to decline de Buck's pressing invitation to come to Rome for the Council.

Forbes now agreed with Pusey in pressing ahead with the preparation of theological propositions to be forwarded to Rome through the agency of Dupanloup. At the beginning of July de Buck returned to Brussels from Rome where he had been one of the theologians working in the preparatory commissions for the Council. From Brussels he advised Forbes that various leading figures in the Roman Curia had responded favourably when he reported, without divulging any names, the negotiations between them. He had in fact received a letter from Forbes, dated 6 June, when he was in Rome and had taken the liberty of showing it, (having first cut off the signature), to his interlocutors as an earnest of Forbes' proposals for reunion. Confident of the reception his reporting had received in Rome de Buck urged that Forbes' theological exposition be ready in time for commencement of the Council, which would be in December 1869. He concluded by telling Forbes he had prayed for him at the tomb of St. Peter in Rome and felt it would not be too long before Forbes could reciprocate. [105]

Forbes now began to disagree more freely with de Buck. That summer he had made a three-week visit to the continent and he told the Jesuit that his contact with diplomatic sources there had convinced him of the ascendency in Rome of the ultramontanist programme. Forbes had spent much of his holiday in Bavaria where he had stayed with Döllinger in Munich. There he had learned of the plans of the ultramontanists for the Council, what he called "the tactics of the extreme party". [106] He also heard of the Bavarian foreign minister's letter to his ambassadors about the political ramifications of the approaching Council. This despatch mentioned the probability that papal infallibility would be declared a dogma and also that the propositions of the Syllabus of Errors would become doctrinal statements. [107] Forbes mentioned this despatch in his letter to de Buck as confirming what he now expected from the Council. Personally, Forbes believed there was something to be said for the pope's reactionary politics which "in view of the present advance of democracy" would act as a "judicious drag-wheel" on contemporary democratic development. Nevertheless, regarding the Syllabus' condemnation of liberalism Forbes considered that to make any political theory a matter of dogma was against the teaching of Christ. He believed the assumption of Mary was a legend and he could not abide infallibility. At a time when the educated classes of Europe often could not accept the doctrines already proclaimed by the Church Forbes censured Rome for seeking "to cram against the stomach of the sense these additional burdens". Regarding de Buck's prayers for him at St. Peter's tomb, Forbes responded with acerbity, saying "I doubt not that they are heard but not perhaps in the sense that they were offered." [108]

Döllinger's increasing antipathy to Rome had evidently shattered Forbes' illusions about the Council, especially concerning papal infallibility, and Forbes had now come to believe there would also be an attempt to obtain a formal

condemnation of Anglican orders. He anticipated there would be no change in the attitude towards Anglicanism from that expressed in the condemnation of the APUC by the Holy Office. Forbes now looked forward to the Council with "simple dread", and for this reason refused to sign a memorial got up by the APUC and the English Church Union petitioning the Pope to involve Anglicans in the Vatican Council. He considered the memorial did not mention the grievance he believed Anglicans could legitimately hold towards the papacy - that it had "exercised a tyranny instead of such a Primacy as belonged to the Divine Constitution of the Church". [109] Forbes' disappointment at the ultramontanist ascendancy in Rome had finally soured his attitude to the papacy, which he previously regarded as a source of ecclesiastical authority to which Anglicans could possibly submit if the papacy had been prepared to be conciliatory.

Referring to his own experiences in Rome, de Buck once again played down the possibility of the ultramontanist programme predominating at the Council. In July 1869 he urged Forbes to complete the projected doctrinal exposition, observing that one of the four prominent Roman Churchmen he had spoken to about it had advised him that if the exposition arrived in Rome in time it could "prevent disagreeable questions being raised" at the Council. "Once more", said de Buck, "let us not recoil before certain difficulties which perhaps are only imaginary and which even were they real could not prevent us in doing our duty." [110] But Forbes now said he would not sign Pius' creed, even with explanations, "as long as it is regarded as the symbol of *individual submission* not *corporate reunion*" and that there were, anyhow, real doctrinal difficulties in it. Yet despite believing the Vatican Council was not going to be the sort of ecumenical council he had called for in his book Forbes was still working on the Anglican rule of faith, but with less and less hope of any good result deriving from it. [111] De Buck promptly

responded by claiming that the creed was not a symbol of individual submission but was rather an expression of the faith of the Catholic Church, and he defended the ecumenicity of the Council. [112]

That September Newman wrote to Pusey also encouraging him to go to Rome as it would be the best way to learn just how the various bishops regarded reunion. If Pusey could not go he should suggest someone else, but Forbes would not do because, as a bishop, he was too official a figure. [113] But by the end of 1869 Forbes was too thoroughly disillusioned about the ecumenical prospects of the Vatican Council in the light of the ultramontanist ascendency to want to go to Rome. Immediately prior to the first formal session of the Council he told de Buck that he expected the Council would only "stereotype [fix] the Ultramontane pretensions". Still he hoped the Holy Spirit would keep the Council from "pernicious action" and that de Buck would do his best as an attending theologian to insert into Council documents the "complementary truths" held by all Christians. [114]

De Buck was now pressing for Forbes' individual conversion. On 13 December 1869 wrote from Rome saying he was "embarrassed" by Forbes' indecision, and that his contact with Forbes was bringing him into suspicion at Rome, presumably among the dominant ultramontanists who demanded personal submission, not negotiation, with Anglican inquirers. He cited Manning's nomination as a cardinal "as a sort of earnest of what awaits you if you decide finally of making the definitive step", and he encouraged Forbes to believe that in doing so he would "be made *effectively* part of the Catholic Church". [115] On 20 December de Buck wrote again, not having given up hope that Forbes would still come to the Council where, he said, Forbes would be received on the basis of the

creed of Pius with explanations. [116] De Buck's theological training disposed him to urge individual conversion where that appeared to be a possibility, and he was was never as compelled by the case for corporate reunion as were Forbes and his other Anglican correspondents. [117] In response, Forbes wrote a long letter clearly spelling out what he called the position of the "Reunionist party in the Church of England". This letter was the closest Forbes came to producing the sought-after doctrinal exposition. The Reunionist party, he said, looked for the corporate reunion of all Christendom as the remedy to the "advancing and all devouring Rationalism of the XIX century". Firstly, they sincerely believed all the statements of faith they were required to sign as Anglicans, interpreting them in a Catholic sense according to the early Fathers. Second, they deplored the schism of the Reformation, accepted their isolation from the rest of Catholic Christendom, but believed the Holy Spirit was working in the Anglican Church. Thirdly, they believed salvation was possible in Anglicanism because they had valid sacraments and a Catholic ministry. They specially pointed to the Oxford Movement which had restored many Catholic practices and produced a higher standard of faith and practice for both clergy and laity. But they had a "conservative horror" for Roman extremes such as the cult of Mary and exaggerated papal claims and would desire these to be authoritatively checked in any reunion proposals. Forbes drew particular attention to this point. The Anglican reunionists, Forbes declared, acknowledged that the division of Anglicanism from "the Great Church of the West" was unsatisfactory. Forbes, however, believed that disestablishment of the Church of England would soon permit the Catholic party to unite with Rome leaving the "Calvinist element" to join the Dissenters. "This", he said, "was what they worked for, even if they did not live to see it". [118] To ensure de Buck had got the point that Forbes was acting in the name of such a party, and was not seeking personal submission to Rome, he told him bluntly on 27 December that "the

question is not an individual one but a corporate one". [119]

On 17 November 1869 the Pope sanctioned the decision of the Holy Office that de Buck cease his correspondence with Anglicans. Pusey's biographer, Henry Liddon, believed the correspondence continued into the next year because the Jesuit general was slow in forwarding the decision to de Buck. [120] The personal campaign for reunion conducted by Pusey and Forbes also came to a definite end when, in March 1870, the copies of part three of Pusey's *Eirenicon - Is Healthful Reunion Possible?* - which he had sent to Dupanloup, were returned, probably also a decision of the authorities in Rome. [121]

When the Vatican Council opened on 8 December 1869 even some Roman Catholics feared it would result in the issuing of dogmas on Mary as Mediatrix of grace, or elevate the anti-liberal propositions of the Syllabus of Errors into dogma. [122] In the event, dogma was proclaimed only on specifically theological matters and issues of Church and state were not included. The decree on the Church became limited to papal infallibility and has to be seen against the desire by the majority of Roman Catholic bishops to defend the Church from the attacks of modern forces. There were good reasons for this fear, especially in Italy where the liberal government had given ample evidence of its anti-Catholicism. But public opinion in Britain was formed by such Roman Catholics as Lord Acton and Döllinger who were antagonistic towards those who saw a conflict between the Church and modern thought and, unlike Italian Churchmen, were less fearful of the forces of liberalism. The Pope also openly favoured the declaration of papal infallibility which made it harder for those opposing the decree, like the French minority bishops, to appear loyal. Therefore, the decree was passed in July 1870 unanimously after opposition bishops absented themselves so as not to vote against

the papal wishes. Eventually, however, all the minority bishops conformed and agreed to the decree. [123] Even without the Holy Office injunction to de Buck the promulgation of papal infallibility by the Council would have terminated the basis for his reunion discussions with Forbes. If de Buck was inclined to be overly-optimistic, and too remote from England and Rome to make entirely accurate assessments about the opinions prevailing in each place, he was at least prepared to regard the views of his Anglican correspondents more charitably, and in a more Catholic light, than was common among his contemporaries. Forbes, spurred on by his own anxieties about the Anglican Church, initially shared de Buck's optimism about the Vatican Council and reunion, but his widespread European contacts and Pusey's influence eventually convinced him that de Buck's hopes were unrealistic. They did, however, continue writing, largely on matters of hagiology, and Forbes visited de Buck in Brussels in 1872. [124]

The First Vatican Council fuelled British anti-papalism and was almost universally condemned in Britain. It was understood by most Anglicans to be the victory of ultramontanists like Manning, and moderate voices within English Roman Catholicism became quiet. Forbes himself made a stinging attack on the Council which occupied the whole of his diocesan charge in August 1871 and which he later published as a separate pamphlet. In it he reiterated and developed the objections he had made to de Buck in his letter of May 1869 when he expressed his resolution to remain an Anglican. He used the same phrase, that the Council had "stereotyped [fixed] a false view of history". Papal infallibility he regarded as without historical precedent or justification; it was a "denial of history" and left doctrine resting upon a "new dogmatic basis" - meaning that "the appeal to history is now heresy". According to Forbes, the doctrine of papal infallibility was not part of the original deposit of revealed truth communicated by Christ to the apostles.

The dogma was therefore an innovation in the belief of Church and consequently illegitimate. The Council, he believed, had exceeded its authority by creating "new objects of faith". [125]

Throughout the 1860's Forbes had attempted to discover a concrete Catholic authority which might form a bastion against the disbelief and doubt of the nineteenth century. In the case of the Vatican Council, Forbes recognised that papal infallibility was the answer of the Roman Church to the "infidelity and materialism of the age" but because it was illegitimate it would not succeed. Forbes, who had long been concerned about the growing disunity of British society, feared that the dogma was a new threat to the social cohesion of Europe. He told his clergy that educated people were having difficulty believing the truths the Church already proclaimed. Papal infallibility would only add to the difficulties of faith for the educated, while it would be accepted by the poor and uneducated. Thereby it would increase the social and religious divisions of Europe.

Forbes believed that the Anglican Church could have an important role in the future as a unifying force because it included, he said, both Protestantism and Catholicism. But he also pointed to some dangers facing the Anglican Church. The theological liberalism of many of the clergy he equated with "unfaithfulness to truth". Liberalism, he said, was the consequence of uncertainty about religious truth, and it resulted in the destruction of every basis for belief but emotionalism. Nor could liberalism provide the social cohesion Forbes expected of religion. It merely criticised belief based on authority, leaving each individual to judge for themselves. But, in proposing a basis for religious certainty other than mere individual judgement Forbes recognized that contemporaries now had a more positive outlook towards human faculties, and a growing abhorrence of the concept

of damnation. Therefore, he believed, Evangelicalism, with its theology of the total corruption of humanity was not a viable alternative for the maintenance of belief. What was needed, Forbes affirmed, was "a more scientific spirit among our clergy", by which he meant systematic theology. Such theology, he thought, would be more in keeping with the ethos of the time. As examples of what he meant he commended the German historical theologians such as Döllinger. If the clergy learned their theology in this more scientific way Forbes thought it would help the laity meet the difficulties of science and biblical criticism by creating a firm religious conviction that "certain things have by legitimate authority been defined to be true". [126] In pointing to the German historians Forbes was reinforcing his criticism of the Vatican Council for decreeing doctrines which he felt were without historical precedent. He told Gladstone he had learned from the Germans the lesson of "the historical involvement of Theology". [127] Forbes was advancing the claim that theology and Christian dogma could find a solid basis for truth in the facts of the Church's history. Such facts, critically established in the way German historians had demonstrated, could provide the scientific basis for religious truth demanded by the educated opinion of the day. It was an extraordinary claim because, in making it, Forbes showed no awareness of the propensity for historical criticism to raise doubts about the historical claims of scripture. He still thought history would merely vindicate scripture. But his solution for educated doubters of an Anglican systematic theology, based upon the historical claims of the Church's teaching as established by historical criticism, revealed how Forbes had refined his old argument from authority for the truth of the Church's doctrine. By 1871 he understood that the teaching of the Church could no longer be upheld by a crude resort to authority if that authority was itself the object of doubt to intelligent persons. He had criticised the Vatican Council for this sort of argument - that a doctrine was true because the Church said so. He had used the same argument himself in the past. But now

he no longer believed it was strong enough to withstand the doubts and disbelief of Victorian men and women. A critical historical basis for doctrinal truth also suited Forbes' theory of an original deposit of revelation. It meant he had only to argue that anything not held by the early Church was an illegitimate innovation. This supported his Tractarian theology in which the faith and practice of the early Church was normative. In turn, this meant that the norm of the early Church could continue to provide Forbes with the theological basis for Catholic reunion. But he was not sufficiently aware that the same historical criticism could also undermine the apparent unanimity of the early Church, making it more difficult for that historical period to provide a theological standard for the contemporary Church. Understanding the early Church as the passive recipient of a complete deposit of supernatural truth may have been too static a model of history, exhibiting over-confidence about the recovery of historical evidence for all Catholic doctrines, but it was the means by which Forbes recovered his intellectual confidence in Anglicanism and came to finally reject contemporary Roman Catholicism as being an historically illegitimate development.

Forbes' hopes for Catholic reunion came closest to being realised in the formation of the Old Catholic Church, whose development he kept in close touch with through his friendship with Döllinger. In 1873 he pressed the Episcopal Synod for an expression of sympathy towards the Old Catholics. [128] The Old Catholic movement had first developed as a protest among German intellectuals to the definition of papal infallibility. The movement was led by professors from German Roman Catholic universities who, in July 1870, began a series of protests against the Vatican Council as neither ecumenical nor valid. By the end of 1870 they became disappointed in their hopes of the protest being led by the bishops. After being suspended from their posts, some professors conformed. But Döllinger did

not, and in April 1871 he was excommunicated for his failure to submit to the Council decrees. The following June, some 18,000 Roman Catholics petitioned the German government to grant them civil recognition as Old Catholics and, in September, they had their first Old Catholic Congress. The German chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, supported the Old Catholics as a means to weaken the Roman Catholic Church in the ongoing *Kulturkampf* between the Church and German nationalism. [129] This first Old Catholic Congress established the doctrinal basis for the movement, with participants from Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and also the Church of Utrecht which had separated from Rome in the seventeenth century over the controversy surrounding Jansenism. The Congress also included some Anglican observers. It repudiated the Vatican Council and maintained its faith on the basis of the creed of Pius IV and the Council of Trent. The Old Catholics upheld the primacy of the Roman bishop but rejected his jurisdiction and claim to independent infallibility, while they demonstrated some liberal sympathies by protesting against the Syllabus of Errors. The Congress also expressed a desire for Christian reunion. While some of this programme, especially with regard to Trent, was transitional, the 1871 Congress established the Old Catholic Church as an independent, though very small, minority in the countries in which it existed. A second Congress also gave greater attention to reunion by forming a reunion committee under Döllinger's chairmanship. In 1873 the Old Catholics accepted episcopal ordination from the Church of Utrecht, although the two Churches remained formally separate until 1889. [130]

In September 1874 an Old Catholic reunion congress was held in Bonn. Forbes did not think his doctor would let him travel to Germany and he was unsure about the conference programme. The Scottish bishops were prepared to be supportive and at the Episcopal Synod in November 1874 they passed a motion of

support and thanksgiving for the Bonn conference, with Forbes as its seconder. The motion expressed agreement with those "who adhere closely to the form of doctrine which was delivered by Apostolic teaching, and held by the Primitive and Undivided Church". [131] The Bonn conference was one of a number of conferences exploring the question of reunion on the basis of the early Church. It provided for a different model to that of corporate reunion, proposing instead the search for intercommunion on the basis of "*unitas in necessariis*", leaving aside those tenets of individual Churches which were not regarded as essential. [132] The Bonn conference concentrated on relations between the Old Catholics and Anglicans, and led to an agreement on some fourteen points. The reunion conferences, however, did not continue after 1875. [133] Forbes drew attention to the Old Catholics in his final synod charge in 1875, maintaining it was a testimony to Anglicanism that the Old Catholic s were forming a similar system - combining an appeal to history with respect for nationalism. He was delighted when his synod, a few days before his death, passed a motion supporting the Bonn reunion conference. [134]

The Old Catholic movement as it stood in the early 1870's was the encapsulation of Forbes' hopes for Christian reunion. The influence of Döllinger in these early years committed the Old Catholics to a Catholicism that increasingly looked to the early Church as paradigmatic and energetically worked for reunion upon that basis. The Old Catholics adopted Döllinger's historical outlook, which was Forbes' also, that what was not explicitly taught by the patristic Church was doctrinal innovation and therefore illegitimate. It is no wonder, therefore, that Forbes supported the Old Catholics so wholeheartedly. Indeed, it may be said that, lacking a Protestant element the Old Catholics upheld Catholicism for Forbes more completely than the Church of England did. While the Old Catholics and the Scottish Episcopal

Church were alike committed to the early Church as normative, the Old Catholic Church also embraced the Catholic ritualism that Forbes desired but was pastorally too cautious to promote in his own Church.

NOTES.

1. APUC minutes, PH.
2. Eleanor Towle, *John Mason Neale*, (1907), 272.
3. A.Thomson to A.P.Forbes, 15 February 1873, BrMS.1.4.789.
4. A.P.Forbes, *An Explanation of the Thirty Nine Articles*, (1867), 81f.
5. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 3 July[1866], Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.301.
6. A.P.Forbes to A.C.Tait, 8 October 1870, Tait Papers, LPL., v.167, f.298.
7. A.J.Beresford-Hope to A.P.Forbes, 22 February 1852, Eeles Papers, LPL.1543, f.75.
8. A.J.Beresford-Hope to A.P.Forbes, 14 March 1852, Eeles Papers, LPL.1543, f.81.
9. A.J.Beresford-Hope to A.P.Forbes, 18 March 1852, Eeles Papers, LPL.1543, f.85.
10. N.Wade to A.J.Beresford-Hope (copy), n.d., Eeles Papers, LPL.1543, f.87.
11. A.J.Beresford-Hope to A.P.Forbes, 26 March 1852, Eeles Papers, LPL.1543, f.91.
12. Henry R.T.Brandreth, *Dr Lee of Lambeth*, (1951), 77-8.
13. Ibid., 48.
14. E.B.Stuart, "Unjustly Condemned? Roman Catholic Involvement in the APUC 1857-64", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 41, (1990), 49.
15. Ibid., 45.
16. Brandreth, *Dr. Lee*, 79.
17. Ibid., 79-80.
18. A.P.Forbes to F.G.Lee, n.d., Lee Papers, LPL.2074, f.129.
19. Brandreth, *Dr. Lee*, 93.
20. Henry R.T.Brandreth, *The Oecumenical Ideas of the Oxford Movement*, (1947), 34.
21. J.B.Pitra to G.H.Forbes (transl. of letter in French), 2 July 1857, SAUL.19.2.146(b).
22. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol.xi, (1967), 390.
23. Robert Harvie Greenfield, "Such a Friend to the Pope", in *Pusey Rediscovered*, ed. Perry Butler, (1983), 174.
24. H.P.Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol.iv, (1897), 112.
25. Ibid., 113.
26. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vii.
27. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes (copy), n.d., PH., BpF.
28. Margaret O'Gara, *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops*, (1988).
29. E.B.Pusey to J.Keble, n.d., PH., PK.vii.
30. Liddon, Op.Cit., 133-4.
31. J.H.Newman to E.B.Pusey, 22 & 23 March 1867, PH., BpF.
32. A.P.Forbes to C.T.Longley, 25 March 1867, Longley Papers, LPL., v.6, f.57.
33. Alan Stephenson, *The First Lambeth Conference 1867*, (1967), 213, 221.
34. *The Guardian*, 31 July 1867, 823.
35. *The Guardian*, 28 August 1867, 933.
36. *The Guardian*, 11 September 1867, 971.
37. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 15 August 1867, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.305.
38. A.P.Forbes to W.K.Hamilton, 29 May[1867]; & 18 July 1867, PH., Hamilton correspondence, 3.14.65 & 6.59.4.

39. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 20 August 1867, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.307.
40. Stephenson, Op.Cit., 328.
41. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 22 September 1867, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.309.
42. Liddon, *Life*, vol.iv., 145-6.
43. A.P.Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty Nine Articles*, (1867-8), iii.
44. E.B.Pusey to P.Pusey, 2 August 1867, PH., Philip Pusey correspondence. v.iii.
45. E.B.Pusey to P.Pusey, 3 January 1868, PH., Philip Pusey correspondence, v.iii.
46. A.P.Forbes, *Explanation*, vi.
47. Ibid., 65.
48. Ibid., 95.
49. Ibid., 92-3.
50. Ibid., 268.
51. Ibid., 289, 423.
52. Ibid., 259-60.
53. Ibid., 132-3.
54. Ibid., 571.
55. Ibid., 557.
56. Ibid., xxx-xxxi.
57. Ibid., 207.
58. Ibid., 297.
59. Ibid., 812-4.
60. J.H.Newman to A.P.Forbes, 6 April 1868, in *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vol. xxiv, (1973), 58.
61. I.Döllinger to A.P.Forbes, 5 October 1868, PH., BpF.
62. E.E.Y.Hales, *Pio Nino*, (1954), 286.
63. Mathias Buschkühl, *Great Britain and the Holy See 1746-1870*, (1982), 134-141.
64. Ibid., 139.
65. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, 20 February 1868, PH., BpF.
66. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 18 October 1864, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.294.
67. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 8 May 1865, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.296.
68. A.P.Forbes to R. Lingard(Guthrie), 30 April 1865, SPC.
69. A.P.Forbes to Monte Cassino abbey, (translation of Italian letter), n.d.[1865], BrMS.1.4.5.894.
70. Bonifacio Ma Krug to A.P.Forbes, 28 February 1866, BrMS.1.4.5.897.
71. A.C.Jemolo, *Church and State in Italy 1850-1950*, (1960), 11-12.
72. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 8 March 1866, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.299.
73. Bonifacio Ma Krug to A.P.Forbes, 8 April 1866, BrMS.1.4.5.898.
74. *The Guardian*, 11 April 1866, 381-2.
75. Bonificio Ma Krug to A.P.Forbes, 18 June 1866, BrMS.1.4.5.901.
76. Bonificio Ma Krug to A.P.Forbes, 27 April 1867, BrMS.1.4.5.904; & L.Tosti to A.P.Forbes (transl. of letter in Italian), 2 May 1867, BrMS.1.4.5.906.
77. L.Tosti to A.P.Forbes (transl. of letter in Italian), 12 June 1868, BrMS.1.4.5.970.
78. Bonificio Ma Krug to A.P.Forbes, 8 August 1868, BrMS.1.4.5.909.
79. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 27 July 1873, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.319.
80. E.B.Pusey to H.P.Liddon, 6 October[1869], PH., Liddon correspondence.

81. J.H.Newman to E.B.Pusey, 24 May 1868, *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, Op.Cit., vol.xxiv, (1973), 78-80.
82. A.P.Forbes to I.Döllinger, n.d. PH., BpF.
83. Liddon. *Life of Dr. Pusey*, iv, 159.
84. Ibid., 158.
85. James P. Jurich, "The Ecumenical Relations of Victor de Buck, S.J., with Anglican Leaders on the eve of Vatican I", (3 vols., unpublished Doctor of Sacred Theology thesis, Catholic University of Louvain, 1988), 271f.
86. Ibid., 245.
87. Ibid., 112f., & 378f.
88. DNB., (1889), vol.55, 102; & Jurich, Op.Cit., 441-2.
89. Jurich, Ibid., 443f.
90. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, (transl. of a letter in French), Septuagesima[24 January]1869, PH., BpF.
91. Jurich, Op.Cit., 461-4.
92. Ibid., 467.
93. Liddon, *Life*, iv, 174.
94. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 8 March 1869, PH., BpF.
95. Jurich, Op.Cit., 493-4.
96. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, n.d.[March 1869], PH., BpF.
97. E.B.Pusey to H.P.Liddon, n.d.[March 1869], PH., Liddon correspondence, f.220.
98. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 10 April 1869, PH., BpF.
99. O'Gara, Op.Cit., 10.
100. Friedrich Heyer, *The Catholic Church from 1648 to 1870*, (1969), 190.
101. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 19 April 1869, PH., BpF.
102. E.B.Pusey to A.P.Forbes, 3 May[1869], PH., BpF.
103. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, "Eve of the Ascension"[5 May]1869, PH., BpF.
104. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 5 May & 20 May 1869, PH., BpF.
105. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 7 July 1869, PH., BpF.
106. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 10 July 1869, PH., BpF.
107. C.Butler, *The Vatican Council 1869-70*, (1962), 77-8.
108. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 10 July 1869, PH., BpF.
109. A.P.Forbes to G.Cobb, 12 July 1869, PH., BpF.
110. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 16 July 1869, PH., BpF.
111. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 24 July 1869, PH., BpF.
112. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 27 July 1869, PH., BpF.
113. J.H.Newman to E.B.Pusey, 16 September 1869, in *Letters and Diaries of Newman*, vol.xxiv, (1973), 333.
114. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 2 December 1869, PH., BpF.
115. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 13 December 1869, PH., BpF.
116. V.de Buck to A.P.Forbes, (transl. of a letter in French), 20 December 1869, PH., BpF.
117. Jurich, Op.Cit., 677-8.
118. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, n.d. [post 20 December 1869], PH., BpF.
119. A.P.Forbes to V.de Buck, 27 December[1869], PH., BpF.
120. Liddon, *Life*, iv, 186.

121. Ibid., 190.
122. Hales, Op.Cit., 277.
123. Ibid., 310.
124. Jurich, Op.Cit., 664.
125. A.P.Forbes, *The Church of England and the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility*, (1871).
126. Ibid.
127. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 19 October 1871, BL.44154, f.316.
128. Handwritten agenda, 18 November 1873, BrMS.1.4.805(ii).
129. Brüschkuhl, Op.Cit., 170.
130. C.B.Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, (1977), 191f.
131. REC.IV., 18 November 1874, SRO., CH.12.60.6, 46-8.
132. Moss, Op.Cit., 260.
133. Ibid., 262-9.
134. Brechin Diocesan Synod Minutes, 5 October 1875, BrMS.4.1.3, 195-7.

7

TRACTARIANISM REVIVED.

By 1870 Forbes had resolved his doubts about Anglicanism and recovered his wholehearted commitment to the Anglican Church. Freed from the counter-attractions of Roman Catholicism he once again became an enthusiastic proponent of Tractarianism, advocating sacerdotalism and the religious life, and upholding the independence of the Church in education and public worship. He regained that confidence in the Tractarian vision of the Church that he nearly lost during the 1860's.

During the 1870's Scottish society was relatively stable and confident about future progress. The passing of the second Reform Act in 1867 had widened the franchise to include most middle-class and skilled working-class men and this expanded electorate had swept Gladstone's Liberal Party to power the following year. The Liberals had overwhelming support in Scotland and Gladstone became a sort of "household god" to many working class families. [1] The confidence of Scottish Episcopalians in their Church was also high. Divisions within the Episcopal Church created by the debate over the Scottish Communion Office had been settled, and the second half of the nineteenth century was a period of unprecedented growth for the Scottish Episcopal Church. During the first half of the century the Church had begun to move into the cities and southern lowland areas from the

rural north. This enabled it to take advantage of both English and Irish immigration into Scotland, and rural migration into the towns. According to the 1851 census, Episcopalians numbered 43,000. By 1877 membership had risen to 56,000, and by 1879 to 63,000, according to the Church's official returns. For the rest of the century membership continued to rise steadily. [2] The Church also benefitted from conversions by middle-class members of the Church of Scotland who desired a more liturgical and aesthetically-pleasing worship. The Episcopal Church had become a respectable part of anglicized society, at least in the lowland south.

As with most late Victorian Churches, the Episcopal Church was experiencing pressure from the laity for a greater involvement in ecclesiastical government. This engendered the final crisis of Forbes' life, a crisis which centred on the question of lay representation in diocesan and general synods. The crisis had been simmering throughout the 1860's. In 1863, the General Synod had given the laity a vote in the election of a bishop. The question of further lay participation came before the Episcopal Synod in 1867 on a remit from the Diocese of Aberdeen. The remit called for lay involvement in temporal matters, but proposed that the laity be excluded from synodical discussion of doctrine and discipline. [3] On that occasion the remit apparently failed to gain sufficient support from the other dioceses to proceed further. But in 1869 the matter again became a serious possibility.

In November 1869 the primus, Robert Eden, received resolutions from all dioceses except Brechin requesting a General Synod to consider lay representation. Forbes was opposed to the move, considering it contrary to the constitution of the Church and "exceedingly dangerous". It was an issue on which, as he told the bishops at the Episcopal Synod on 16 November, he felt "very strongly". Notwithstanding Forbes' objections, the bishops referred the matter back to special

diocesan synods to determine the exact extent of the lay representation they desired. The bishops sought widespread debate of the prospective innovation, requesting that various lay office-holders be asked to attend and to speak at the special synods. [4]

Before the special synod of the Diocese of Brechin met in June 1870 Forbes issued a Pastoral Letter to the clergy and laity of his diocese on the subject of lay representation. Once again he referred to his concern over widespread uncertainty about religious truth and said he believed the desire for lay representation to be a symptom of this religious restlessness. He disavowed any intention to unchurch the laity, or to grant the clergy overweening power, but claimed it was the prerogative of the clergy to formulate and teach doctrine, as a consequence of their ordination and theological training. Forbes understood this authority to be threatened by lay representation in synods because it would involve theologically-untrained laity in the decisions of the only bodies in the Episcopal Church capable of formulating doctrine into a canonical, binding form.

> The faith is as dear to the layman as to the clergyman. He has the same interest in it. The *depositum* has been consigned to the body of the faithful. It rests in the Church; and the Church is not the clergy, but the clergy and laity together, the body, the members of Christ. Nevertheless, while the faith reposes in the body, the power to determine and judge of it has ever been held to rest in the hierarchy. [5]

Forbes understood the synods of the Church to be the highest enunciators of the content of the Christian faith. Such doctrinal responsibility could not be given to the laity who were uneducated in theology, which he thought to be a technical science. For the laity to have such responsibility was also a usurpation of the clergy's divine commission of ordination. What was true of doctrine for Forbes was also true of discipline and ritual in the Church. Both of these were the prerogative of the clergy because they were consequences of doctrine - with discipline the

"practical aspect" and ritual the "devotional aspect". [6] Forbes' objections were solely to the laity being involved in the formulation of doctrine. While this lay in the hands of the clergy, he also believed the clergy should consult the laity about doctrinal matters prior to a synodical decision; in fact, he held the consent of the laity to be necessary in matters of faith and morals. [7]

On 1 June 1870, the special synod of the Diocese of Brechin met to discuss lay representation. The majority of the Brechin clergy favoured a resolution which envisaged General Conventions involving lay and clerical representatives in addition to the diocesan clergy continuing to meet separately in synod. Such Conventions would not be free to initiate action on doctrinal matters but would have to consent to any canon for it to be binding. Trials for heresy would remain the prerogative of the synod, but the Convention could deal with trials for immorality. Following the debate Forbes opined that "from the very beginning of my Episcopate, I have always entertained the greatest dread of this lay movement". Referring obliquely to the constitutions of some Anglican Churches in the colonies (such as in New Zealand) which gave the laity a place in synod, Forbes said he thought it a consequence of the "democratic spirit apparently inseparable from English colonial life". In addition to the objection he had raised in his Pastoral Letter he now said he also opposed the move because there was no precedent for it in the early church, and it would involve the laity in questions which would "agitate and unsettle their faith". So strongly did Forbes feel upon this question that, in an unprecedented action, he used his canonical power to refuse to give effect to the synod's resolution. [8]

Understanding lay representation as a threat to the Church's doctrine, Forbes could not be otherwise than deeply perturbed about it. All through his episcopate

he had strongly defended the Tractarian connection between doctrine and divine revelation, and he believed that a precise and systematic exposition of doctrine by the Church to be its best defence against religious uncertainty. Now he saw these cherished beliefs at risk if theologically-illiterate laity appropriated the spiritual authority of the clergy. It would result, he assumed, in poor, or even incorrect, doctrinal definition. It would also represent a submission to prevailing democracy which would destroy the divinely ordained hierarchy of ecclesiastical society. In Forbes' argument, Tractarian sacerdotalism also upheld the bishops' control of the Episcopal Church, already maintained by the old nonjuring tradition of monarchic episcopacy. The laity were more independent of the ecclesiastical hierarchy than the clergy and therefore more difficult for the bishops to control. It was a hierarchy of authority, not of privilege, that Forbes was concerned to defend. He held the laity to be as much a part of the Church as the clergy. But if the clergy's authority over doctrine was lost then the connection between doctrine and its divine source, via doctrine's teachers, would be severed. Forbes became anxious to avoid a General Synod which, as the highest authority in the Episcopal Church, could allow the laity to be represented in synods if that so pleased a majority. If this happened, Forbes felt he would have to resign, so seriously did he regard the issue, and so much did it threaten his beliefs. [9]

At the Episcopal Synod in November 1870, the primus reported that all the dioceses were in favour of increasing lay involvement, most of them by simply admitting laity to the present synods. Brechin and Aberdeen, however, wanted separate General Conventions. Except for one, all dioceses wanted restrictions on lay participation in matters of doctrine, discipline and worship, and all dioceses but Brechin, (because of Forbes' refusing his synod's resolution) resolved to request a General Synod to determine the question. Nonetheless, by a majority of three to

two, a motion proposed by Forbes - that the bishops were not prepared to call a General Synod at that time - succeeded. Because of insufficient agreement among the dioceses about the exact nature of lay participation, a majority of the bishops decided to postpone further action. [10]

In 1873, while the matter was still under discussion by the bishops, Forbes reisssued his Pastoral Letter in a pamphlet, now raising further objections to the innovation. This time Forbes largely turned his objections on the existing influence of the laity in the Episcopal Church, which he described as already predominant because of the clergy's inferior social position. He also drew attention to the role of many Episcopalian laity who were heritors in the Church of Scotland by virtue of their role as feu holders. This, Forbes argued, gave them divided ecclesiastical loyalities. The increasing numbers of converts from the Church of Scotland also meant many new Episcopalians had not sufficiently absorbed the ethos of their new Church. He feared the Church would be "affected by the great tide of democracy, which is sweeping every institution into the hands of the proletariat". On the one hand he thought the teaching of the Church suffered from the overly-influential upper classes with their connections with the Established Church. On the other, he was anxious lest the determination of doctrine be exposed to the theologically-illiterate masses. Such a *magisterium* of the doctrinally-unconcerned laity, he believed, would only result in the breakdown of the "dogmatic basis of the church" and the triumph of the "lax popular undogmatic Christianity" of the liberal theologians. [11] In the same year Forbes also issued, in conjunction with the Bishops of Aberdeen and Glasgow who favoured the *status quo*, a pamphlet claiming that there was no historical or theological evidence for the synodical representation of the laity. [12]

In the event, although the issue came up for discussion at Episcopal Synods in succeeding years, no General Synod was called before Forbes' death. In fact, nothing further was done about lay representation in synods by the Episcopal Church until the twentieth century.

The effective stalling of a General Synod in November 1870 ended the last controversy of Forbes' life. His remaining energies were directed less towards defending the Catholic faith, and more towards its extension within the Church and its promotion outside it. Chief among such enterprises was his founding in 1871 of a religious sisterhood in Dundee, known as the Community of Saint Mary and Saint Modwenna*. In 1861 Forbes had invited Mrs Frances Bolland, a wealthy English clergyman's widow, to work in Dundee as a district visitor. Two years later Forbes, as Bishop of Brechin, was bequeathed a house at 10 King Street, Dundee, plus £800 to use at his discretion. With Forbes' encouragement, Mrs Bolland decided to test her vocation to the religious life. She and another woman went to the Community of All Saints, in Margaret Street, London, for their novitiate, with the intention of returning to establish a sisterhood in Dundee. [13] Forbes drew up a rule for the community and, on 18 August 1870, laid the foundation stone of a chapel at the King Street premises. [14] The following year he consecrated the chapel and installed Frances Bolland as Superior of a community with nine nuns. [15] The sisters concentrated on pastoral work in the five city congregations of Dundee, among mill girls, the aged and the house-bound; and later they ran a home for incurables and a small orphanage. [16]

* Modwenna was an Irish nun who lived in the ninth century and founded two nunneries in Scotland, at Stirling and Edinburgh, before departing for England in c.840. [A.Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, vol.vii, 69-70.]

The sisterhood was the most tangible fruit of Forbes' long interest in the religious life which stretched back to his days as an Oxford undergraduate when he joined the quasi-monastic Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity. In 1849 he had published a pamphlet on the religious life for women entitled *A Plea for Sisterhoods*, arguing that such communities were a means of meeting the ever-growing social and religious needs of the towns, especially as trained nurses and prison visitors. Emphasizing their utilitarian work, Forbes argued that sisterhoods could provide an alternative to marriage and motherhood for women who could not find fulfilment in this way. The promotion of the religious life for women was a Tractarian challenge to the Victorian ideal of the gentlewoman, whose function was solely that of wife and mother. This social expectation left middle and upper class women who did not marry little prospect of useful lives other than doing genteel charitable work. Forbes asked if the usual activities regarded as accomplishments for gentlewomen, such as painting, music, and languages, could be regarded as "*the* occupation of life"? He believed many educated women, faced with only this future, became weary of life, and that such frustration was the cause of unhappy marriages and "lifelong sorrow". He also advocated the religious life to women from the poorer classes for whom it could offer a better and more purposeful life. [17]

Nor was Forbes' understanding of religious life for women limited solely to the theoretical. There is evidence for his connection with the Park Village sisterhood (the Sisterhood of the Holy Cross) established by Pusey in 1845, which was the first Anglican religious community. Among its initial members was Mary Bruce who, after she left the community because of ill-health, went to work in Dundee to manage the training school for schoolmistresses founded by Forbes. [18] Forbes also gave extreme unction to one of the dying sisters of the Park Village

community in 1850, in what is generally regarded as the first recorded instance of unction administered in the Church of England, (other than the Nonjurors), since the Reformation. [19] The historian of Anglican religious communities connects Forbes also with the Society of the Most Holy Trinity, the second Anglican sisterhood to be established (in 1848). He claims that the original rule of this community envisaged a bishop other than the diocesan Bishop of Exeter as visitor and that this "could only have been Forbes". [20] In 1850 no other bishop in England or Scotland was as amenable to the vowed religious life as Forbes so this judgement is probably correct.

In addition to Forbes, a number of Tractarian parish priests established sisterhoods to assist in parish work. They included Thomas Chamberlain, Forbes' vicar when he was a curate in Oxford, J.M.Neale, a friend of Forbes, and T.T.Carter, another friend, who, in 1852, founded the Community of St. John the Baptist, and whom Forbes consulted when he was establishing his Dundee community. [21] Carter, an experienced priest and spiritual director, was one among many contemporaries who felt the force of Forbes' attractive personality. Recalling his conversations with Forbes concerning the prospective sisterhood, Carter observed:

> Even in those short interviews one could not but be deeply struck with the clear, bright single-hearted devotion, the immistakeable[sic] piety, the gentleness & refinement of his mind, the accomplished talents, the delightful & genial tone of intercourse, which made his society so charming, & the grace of his manner so attractive. I know no one who left on me the impression so strongly as he did, & that quite unselfconsciously, of a pure devotion & a high sense of duty, & this, in the most engaging manner, united with high intellectual gifts. [22]

These religious communities owed their existence to the influence of the Tractarians on responsive women, so that the institution of the religious life was

one of the most characteristic and enduring facets of the Oxford Movement. It was an encapsulation of the Oxford Movement's desire for holiness within the Church.

> What lies at the heart of the Oxford Movement as a direct inheritance from the early Church is the religion of the heart, the ideal of a life lived in conformity with the cross of Christ and this ideal is that which was central to early monasticism. Pusey, Newman and Keble were not unaware that almost every writer they admired, both in the early Church and in the Middle Ages, was a monk. All the Christian writings they proposed to their fellow Christians came from the milieu of monasticism. [23]

Therefore, signs of this pursuit of holiness through the religious life constantly surfaced during the course of the Oxford Movement - in the translation of the Sarum Breviary in the *Tracts for the Times* as an inducement to the clergy to recite the daily office; in Hurrell Froude's proposals for colleges of unmarried priests; in the mooting of sisters of mercy by Pusey and Newman; and in Newman's μοναὶ at Littlemore.

Forbes' interest was not restricted to the religious life for women. He was a direct participant in two of the more successful nineteenth-century efforts to establish the religious life for men in the Anglican Communion. The first of these was the Society of the Holy Cross, a devotional society for priests founded in 1855 by Charles Lowder, the famous slum priest of east London. The Society's original rule envisaged that some members would take traditional monastic vows, although they would not live in community. Although never a member, Forbes was used by the Society as an adviser on various occasions, and when the Society introduced retreats into the Church of England Forbes made his first retreat with the members, in 1859. [24] His experience of these retreats with the Society of the Holy Cross encouraged Forbes to introduce them for his own clergy from 1867, making him one of the first Anglican bishops to do so. George Grub, his curate during the 1870's, described his experience of a retreat given by Forbes in which the bishop gave the addresses dressed in purple biretta, surplice and stole. [25]

The first religious community for men in the Anglican Communion was the Society of St. John the Evangelist (SSJE) founded in 1866, and Forbes came very close to joining as one of its founding members. By the time of the first meeting in the summer of 1865 to consider the possibility of establishing the community, Forbes had been favourably impressed by his experience of visiting at least two monasteries - the Benedictine abbey at Monte Cassino and the Cistercian abbey founded at Mount St. Bernard by Ambrose Phillips de Lisle. This initial meeting to discuss the foundation of the SSJE included Forbes, as well as Richard Benson, one of his friends from his Oxford days and then Vicar of Cowley, Oxford, who was the leader of the group. Two of the group, including Benson, had already decided to proceed and the meeting adjourned to give Forbes time to consider his position. At the next meeting Forbes decided not to join because of his uncertain health and his diocesan commitments. However, he continued to interest himself in the project and, along with Pusey, advised Benson to first establish the community before seeking support from ecclesiastical authority. [26] Both men must have feared that otherwise the plan for a community with formal religious vows would be mitigated by English bishops to whom vows smacked of Roman Catholicism. [27]

Along with his attraction towards vowed religious life, Forbes' enduring interest in spirituality was also manifest in 1872 when he gave a paper entitled *Of the Deepening of the Spiritual Life* to the Church Congress held that year in Leeds. The Church Congresses had begun in 1861 as unofficial gatherings of Anglican clergy and laity which met to discuss contemporary issues. The 1872 venue enabled Forbes to return and stay for a few days in his old parish of St. Saviour's. [28] In his paper of 1872, his most mature writing on spirituality, he understood the spiritual life for all Christians to be, like religious life, a training in spiritual discipline. Presupposing an Augustinian necessity for grace to initiate any human

response to God, Forbes concerned himself in the paper with the human dimension of spiritual growth. While most of what Forbes said were commonplaces of ascetic theology, it was no doubt reasonably new to his audience as this theological discipline had only recently been revived in the Church of England by Pusey's translations of Roman Catholic works from the 1840's. Basically, Forbes adopted the classical model of western Christian spirituality which understood the spiritual life as proceeding through three stages in relation to the effect of God on the soul - purgation, illumination and union. However, in the paper he almost completely devoted his comments to the purgative way, or the need for purification of the soul as the first step towards perfect union with God. This emphasis gave the paper an overly-scrupulous slant, which probably derived from Pusey's grim spiritual influence on Forbes' natural conscientiousness. But his emphasis may also have been determined by Forbes' desire to be relevant to the needs of his audience, for whom comments on the beginning stages of the spiritual life would have been most pertinent.

Forbes' basic theme was the need of sorrow for sin. "Life", he said, "is in the long-run, at its brightest, a period of sorrow". [29] Proceeding from this understanding he concentrated on the influence of sin in human life and proposed various spiritual remedies such as the need for self-knowledge, control of the passions, and avoidance of sinful pursuits. He referred to some of the problems of contemporary life for spiritual growth, singling out ritualism and "busyness" which could lead to a concentration on external life rather than the inner life of the soul. To balance this emphasis on the negative effects of life he recommended developing a recollection of the presence and love of God. Particularly he advocated meditation, the recitation of the daily office, and understanding the eucharist as the expression of the condescending love of Christ. He encouraged his

hearers to believe in one of the elementary truths of the spiritual life - that it is in whatever occupation of life they found themselves that God willed their sanctification. [30] He also reassured them that, despite the problems of spiritual development, they had received sufficient grace for such growth in baptism, and that any additional sin could be dealt with by forgiveness through confession. [31] Forbes ended on his favourite theme of the need for an accurate theological understanding of Christ. The worship of Christ as God and man, he said, "is the Christian life" and this especially entailed having a right conception of Christ as he has revealed himself - "for only that accurate Truth is the Truth which will make us free and save us". [32]

In the same year as his address to the Leeds Church Congress, on 28 October 1872, Forbes was guest of honour at a luncheon in Dundee given by the Diocese of Brechin to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration as a bishop. Robert Thom gave an address on behalf of the diocese, and Forbes was presented with a pastoral staff for his use and that of his successors in the diocese. In reply, Forbes said that he had not in the past "been used to overmuch praise, and therefore you may believe it is very sweet to me". "This is", he added, "one of the most gratifying events that have ever taken place in m y life." [33] He said he had always attempted in Dundee to combine the definite message of the Church with a concern to promote the "social and industrial civilization of the country". Confident that the Episcopal Church was now becoming "emphatically expansive", Forbes saw his Church taking a more prominent position in Scottish society than it had when he had first came to Dundee. The Episcopal Church in Dundee had, he claimed, "with great self-sacrifice, gone out into the lanes and streets of the city, and dealt with a population, which would not have been dealt with otherwise". [34]

But Forbes' efforts to promote the Church's involvement in the civic affairs of Dundee had not been without strain. The promotion of their narrow class interests by the Liberal bourgeoisie of Dundee, had often conflicted with Forbes' Tory paternalism, old-fashioned social benevolence, and distrust of emerging democracy. By the early 1870's, Forbes could no longer accept the sectional politics of Dundee middle-class Liberalism, despite his personal admiration for the Liberal party leader, and his political allegiance to Gladstone when he was the member for Oxford University. In August 1873 he wrote to Gladstone to say that he was reverting to his traditional Conservative loyalties. He claimed that "twenty years collision with the selfish democracy of Dundee has thrown me much back upon the Tory traditions in which I was bred & from which for a time I confess I swerved under the charm of your eloquence and character". [35]

In 1874, Forbes' health, never robust, seriously failed. In May of that year, he was invited to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church at the first Church Congress held in Scotland, which met in Edinburgh. He was to give a sermon in St. John's, Princes Street, but a few days before he collapsed and the sermon had to be cancelled, although he later recovered. [36]

Forbes was well enough to give his synod address on 1 October 1874. It was largely concerned with the Scottish Education Act which he understood to herald "an epoch in the intellectual history of Scotland". [37] The Act of 1872 was designed to provide a new national, undenominational, elementary education system by establishing state schools managed by elected school boards and funded by rates. Under the Act, attendance at either a board school or an independent school was compulsory for children between the ages of five and thirteen, while those too poor to attend the board schools would receive assistance from the Poor Law. All three

Presbyterian churches were in agreement with the board schools, which provided religious instruction on the basis of the Shorter Catechism. [38] Forbes was not persuaded the Act was necessary in rural areas where it would bring increased taxation, and where the transfer of schools from heritors and presbyteries, he suspected, would not be an "unmitigated advantage". Presumably, Forbes was anxious about the social consequences of a reduction of the traditional influence of the established Church and the principal landowners in these areas. But whatever his worries about the country areas, Forbes was convinced that the Act was "absolutely necessary" in the towns, where the population had outgrown the old system. Personally, he would have preferred the denominational system to have been continued, with a conscience clause allowing parents to remove their children from religious instruction. He thought such a system would have been fairer to tax payers (possibly on the basis of user-pays), and that the denominational system, with state support, could have met projected needs. A system of religious instruction based upon the Presbyterian, Calvinist Shorter Catechism was not acceptable to the Episcopal Church, since Calvinism had been rejected by that Church after 1689. Forbes therefore defended the action of the Episcopal Church in not transferring their schools to the control of school boards. The bishops had sought to secure the continuation of government grants for Episcopalian schools, while at the same time supporting board schools by acquiescing in school rates and agreeing to serve on school boards. Forbes pointed to the schools established by the Episcopal Church as one significant means by which Scottish prejudice toward his Church had been mitigated. But he thought Episcopalian Church schools in country areas would be difficult to maintain after the Act because of the higher salaries for teachers in board schools. Therefore he urged richer Episcopalians to be generous in maintaining their rural schools. He ended by defending Church schools precisely because they permitted denominational teaching, or the "dogmatic teaching of the

faith", as a necessary alternative to the non-denominational board schools which would, he thought, only teach "a vague, sentimental Christianity". [39]

One historian of Scottish education in the nineteenth century has pointed to the influence of secularization as providing one of the keys to understanding the growing role of the state in providing non-denominational education. In Scotland the historical precedent of an existing denominational national system under the old parish schools predisposed public opinion to favour a non-denominational national system of education. [40] By the 1870's, with a greatly increased population, Scotland could maintain a national system of elementary education only with the resources of the state, and that inevitably meant secular pressure for a reduction in denominational teaching in public education. But the resulting non-denominational religious instruction enacted in the board schools was too indefinite to suit Forbes because, he believed, morality was based upon definite Christian beliefs as opposed to the "latitudinarian spirit which prevails extensively in the literature of the day". [41]

In many respects, Forbes was increasingly out of step with British society in the 1870's. His paternalism towards the poor was being challenged by the hardening of class divisions, and by movements which sought greater autonomy and less dependence for the working class. One of Forbes' curates during this time recalled that whereas previously "a well-known clerical collar" ensured a welcome among Dundee's tenements, this began to change in the later 1870's under the influence of anti-religious socialism. [42] Forbes' paternal charity, aimed at alleviation of the poor rather than social change, began to strike less of a chord among the labouring poor than previously as the 1870's witnessed a change among some sections of the urban poor - from religious indifference or residual respect, to increasing

antagonism towards religion. Forbes' attachment to a society united in bonds of hierarchical dependence no longer corresponded to the new democracy emerging with the development of Gladstonian Liberalism in the late 1860's and early 1870's. Towards the new democratic society Forbes continued to be unsympathetic, largely because he thought it a threat to the Church and the maintenance of Christian belief. A democratic society would cut the lower orders loose from the Christian influence of the upper classes. As he had perceived in Dundee, increasing democracy would disintegrate society into sectional interests, antagonistic to one another, which would imperil society's weakest members - the poor. Democracy would also bring the laity into ecclesiastical government, threatening the precision of doctrine under the influence of theological ignorance. Forbes knew he was living in a time of social transition, but regarded most of the changes as leading to a more divided, less caring society where the influence of Christianity was endangered. So, for example, with regard to the 1872 Education Act: he appreciated the need for state involvement in education for the new urbanized society, but would have preferred state subsidy of denominational schools rather than non-denominational state schools. State involvement was necessary to meet the need for popular education, but Church schools remained the best means of ensuring specific Christian teaching.

Forbes' concern for the establishment and maintenance of independent Episcopal elementary schools was motivated by his Tractarianism. Believing that individual and social morality was fundamentally motivated by the beliefs a person held, he desired specific denominational teaching for children free from the influence of the liberal state. Independent Church schools were an expression of the spiritual independence of the Church from the Erastian state. His Tractarian dislike of Erastianism also activated Forbes' opposition to the attempt to curb ritualism in

the Church of England by parliamentary legislation, in the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act in 1874. The Act had been drafted by Archbishop Tait of Canterbury who hoped it would be a means to securing the internal unity of the Church of England, currently divided over ritualism, and, at the same time, help to retain the Church's links with the state. Parliamentary legislation to enforce liturgical uniformity became possible in 1874 because of increasing Protestant anger towards ritualist clergy who had alienated moderate opinion by their refusal to obey the admonitions of their bishops. A recently elected Conservative government, with little else on its legislative programme, was also susceptible to pressure from Tait for such legislation. When passed in August 1874, the Act provided for the appointment of a barrister or ex-judge, rather than the diocesan bishop, to try ritual cases. It was the one of the last attempts by Parliament to impose legislation on the Church of England against the opposition of a substantial party of that Church's members. But the Act was unworkable when the defiance of Anglo-Catholic clergy became apparent in the imprisonment of four priests for contumacy between 1877 and 1882. [43]

In a letter to Pusey during 1874, Forbes said he thought the Public Worship Act made a *reductio ad absurdum* out of the establishment of the Church of England because it had reduced the Church's most solemn institutions to the level of "playthings of...the House of Commons". He believed the English bishops had acted precipitately in agreeing with Tait on the need for legislative coercion. He was, moreover, convinced that the ritualist movement would be strengthened by what it perceived as persecution. [44] Forbes' further opinion on the Act, and ritualism in general, came in his 1875 synod charge. He first welcomed the relaxing of ties between the landowning classes and the Church of Scotland after the abolition of lay patronage in that Church by the Church Patronage (Scotland) Act

1874. Forbes welcomed the Patronage Act as likely to increase the attachment of Episcopalian landlords towards their own Church by diminishing their responsibilities to the established Church. Forbes noted with approval the increased interest in the external beauty of worship in the Church of Scotland. This, he believed, was creating a taste for aesthetic worship which only the liturgical worship of the Episcopal Church could satisfy. While he thought the Episcopalian laity needed to be protected against clergy suddenly and unilaterally introducing liturgical ritual "disproportionate" to their congregation's religious life, he disparaged the English Public Worship Regulation Act as pandering to the "prejudices of the British Phil istine". Forbes believed that because this Act was opposed by many sincere and zealous clergy in the Church of England it was doomed to fail. But he also expressed his conviction that ritualism had its limitations. Both the emotional religion of the ritualists and the widespread desire for decent order in the Church, he asserted, were insufficient without first "securing the intellectual position of the Anglican Church" upon teaching with an historical and dogmatic basis. [45]

Forbes was not present at the 1875 synod to read his charge in person. Due to a severe gastric illness his charge was read by the synod clerk. At first Forbes, with his history of illness, was not thought to be seriously unwell, but on 7 October an English priest* who was staying with him heard his confession and administered the last rites of the Church. The following day, 8 October 1875, just after 8 o'clock in the evening, aged fifty-eight, Forbes died, while attended by James Nicolson and three nuns of his community. [46] His body lay in state,

---

* The Revd. R.S.Hunt, Vicar of Markbeech, near Edenbridge, had attended Forbes during a previous illness. [Mackey, 206.]

dressed in his episcopal robes, in the Castlehill clergyhouse. Some 5000 people came to pay their last respects. [47] The funeral was held in St. Paul's, Dundee, on 15 October, having been preceded by five celebrations of Holy Communion. It was estimated that between two and three thousand lay admirers of all classes attended, as well clergy from England and Scotland, who processed to the church from the school in the Seagate. [48] The body of the bishop, in episcopal robes, and enclosed in three coffins, was finally laid to rest in a vault under the chancel of St. Paul's, as he had requested. [49]

Pusey did not attend the funeral, telling James Nicolson that it had been "sometime since I ceased to be able to be present at the last sad office". The shock of his younger friend's death grieved Pusey greatly, and he choked when he tried to speak of him. [50] But, by December, Pusey was able to pen a portrait of Forbes for Henry Liddon, in which he remarked on Forbes' revived spirits in the final years of his life, after the trauma of his heresy trial.

> What strikes me most about the dear Bishop in looking back are his great love, tenderness, simplicity, and self-forgetfulness, and his sensitiveness about whatever bore on doctrinal truth. That trial was like the piercing of a sword to him, for fear the truth should be compromised, or in defence lest he should any way compromise it. He did not recover the physical effects of it, in any degree, for two years...His happiest time was that which he spent in the hospitals by the sick, or in the alleys of Dundee, if so he might minister to souls or bodies. Then there was his utter want of self-consciousness. He had, as you know, brilliant conversational talents, yet no one could ever detect the slightest perception that he was aware of it. So also as to his theological knowledge. He had a large grasp of mind, devoted loyalty to truth, sorrow for those who had it not, tender feeling for them; but for himself utter unconsciousness of his gifts. [51]

Tributes came from many quarters. Some of those who memorialized Forbes' death found it apposite that his last-attended diocesan function - on 21 September 1875 - had been the laying of the foundation stone of a new church at Stonehaven, his very first charge in the Episcopal Church. Gladstone expressed his respect and admiration for Forbes as "a man of devoted life and labour, of wide learning, of

balanced mind, uniting with a strong grasp of Catholic principles the spirit of a true historic student and a genuine zeal for literary culture". [52] The primus, Robert Eden, commented that the history and traditions of the Episcopal Church were "entwined with his very heartstrings". Eden believed that Forbes' piety and "uncompromising adherence to dogma", had restrained many people unsettled by liberal theological speculation or the prevalent erastianism in England from seeking shelter within Roman Catholicism. [53] Newman, surprised at Forbes' death, feared for its effect on Pusey and said a mass for Forbes' soul. [54] James Nicolson, who had the task of notifying friends and acquaintances of the death, gave his opinion of his close friend in a sermon preached the Sunday after the funeral. He remarked on Forbes' delightful conversation, impressive personality, and "deep and unaffected" piety. He recalled that when Forbes said his daily office he seemed "penetrated through and through with religion". Nicolson, however, did not overlook the harsher side of Forbes' character, and observed that he was often considered "uncharitable in his judgements". But he noted that Forbes avoided expressing judgements against those outside the Church; they were "left in God's merciful hands". Nicolson evidently believed that Forbes' severest judgements were reserved for those within the Church who he believed were maligning or distorting dogmatic truth.

Forbes' death attracted widespread attention. A United Presbyterian minister in Dundee, George Gilfillan, referred to Forbes in a sermon as one very well known in the city. Gilfillan believed Forbes' views were, in many respects, "exceedingly narrow", but added, "his heart was broad. He might be called, indeed, the father of the poor in his locality, and he was unwearied night and day in his attentions to the outcast, the destitute, and the forlorn." Recounting one incident that particularly impressed him, Gifillan referred to a Dr. George Aspinall who had

come to Dundee to be the clergyman for a group of low church Episcopalians disaffected by Forbes' teaching. Soon after his arrival Aspinall was stricken with paralysis and sent for Gilfillan, who was a previous acquaintance. However, when the minister arrived he found Forbes already by Aspinall's bedside. Forbes continued to care for his erstwhile opponent thoughout his illness, raised money for his needs and petitioned the Archbishop of Canterbury on his behalf. Unfortunately, the clergyman died before something could be done. Gilfillan concluded, Forbes was "a gentleman, a scholar, and a Christian". [55] One of the ministers of the Church of Scotland in Dundee spoke of Forbes as a man of "conciliation and highest Christian courtesy, by which he always disarmed prejudice and opposition". [56] But the Evangelical *Record*, while acknowledging Forbes' "self-denying labours", nevertheless asserted these were "calculated to exercise over others an ensnaring influence" - a recognition of the evangelistic motivation of his Catholic piety and philanthropy Forbes would no doubt have been ready to acknowledge. [57] The *Daily News* believed that Forbes' decision not to remain in the Church of England, but to accept the bishopric in his native Scotland, had restricted his wider influence. At the same time the *Daily News* admitted, that "with the clergy of his school his name was a power". [58] Perhaps the most balanced tribute to Forbes came from the *Dundee Advertiser*:

> Whatever may be thought of his ecclesiastical views, his earnestness, his benevolence, and his piety will long be cherished in remembrance. While naturally aristocratic in his tone, Bishop Forbes keenly sympathised with the masses, and showed this not only by his readiness to further every benevolent movement, but by his anxiety to heal the breaches between the divided classes. He was the first to call upon us during the recent strike to suggest mediation between the employers and employed; and in various instances when the poor were suffering greatly from want of employment his appeals on their behalf opened the fountains of public liberality. [59]

The *Guardian*, the weekly Anglican newspaper, made the perceptive social comment that Forbes was "more popular as a rule with the extremes of society at each end of the social scale than with those of the intermediate class". [60]

Shortly before his death, Forbes had expressed the wish for a purpose-built episcopal residence. He said he had been feeling the effects of living in the unsalubrious centre of Dundee for twenty-eight years and, as the next bishop would not be incumbent of the St. Paul's congregation, there was no need for his successor to live there. Forbes, however, died before the plan could be implemented. [61] At a public meeting in Dundee on 23 October to discuss a memorial to Forbes it was resolved that money be raised to build a house for the Bishops of Brechin, complete with private chapel, and that another suitable memorial should be placed in St. Paul's.* A month later subscriptions totalled nearly £4000, led by £500 from Forbes' beloved nephew, George Boyle, now the sixth Earl of Glasgow. Other close friends also gave generously, including £100 each from Lord Kinnaird, from Forbes' former chaplain Roger Lingard-Guthrie, and from Forbes' eldest brother William. Other English and Scottish Churchmen who contributed included the primus, James Nicolson, Canon Henry Liddon, his old vicar Thomas Chamberlain, and the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity. [62] Gladstone gave £150. [63] Another meeting to foster the memorial was held in the chapter-house of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, in early December 1875. Canon Liddon, the leading Anglo-Catholic, in proposing the resolution to support the Scottish memorial fund, said he had known Forbes as a close friend for many years. As a man, Liddon said Forbes was distinguished by qualities of tenderness and moral courage. As a bishop, Liddon recalled his first visit to Dundee, where he was surprised by the experience of having all the men they passed take their hats off to Forbes.

---

* Eventually the episcopal residence was built at Broughty Ferry, but it was sold by the diocese earlier this century. The memorial in St. Paul's, Dundee, in the form of a recumbent statue of Bishop Forbes in his episcopal robes, still survives in the cathedral's chancel.

Referring to the respect accorded to the Episcopal bishop, Liddon remarked that it was "almost impossible for me to believe that I was in a Presbyterian city". When Liddon observed to Forbes that he seemed to have a very large flock, Forbes dismissed the acknowledgements with a modest remark: "Oh! they are very good natured". Liddon was none the less convinced that the people of Dundee recognised Forbes as a "great chief of the Church of Christ" despite their Presbyterian prejudices against bishops.* [64] But Liddon believed that Forbes' greatest significance was as a theologian. Here, Liddon believed, Forbes' fondness for *a priori* reasoning and fine distinctions was restrained by his dedication to what was historically true. "He wished to be true", affirmed Liddon, "to all that the undivided Church had really taught, and to nothing whatever beyond." Dean Richard Church of St. Paul's, however, remembered the far-off days when the Tractarians were ascendant at Oxford, and he recalled seeing Forbes for the first time as an undergraduate in Newman's company. Perhaps of all the obituaries it was Church who encapsulated all that Forbes, as a rejuvenated Tractarian, would most have valued, when he described him as "one of those who received and maintained in their purest form the best influences of the great movement with which Dr. Newman's name was associated". [65]

* The doffing of hats may have had more to do with respect for Forbes' philanthropy rather than his episcopate.

NOTES.

1. W.Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, (1968), 325.
2. R.Currie et.al., *Churches and Church-Goers*, (1977), 219, 132-3.
3. REC.III., 20 November 1867, SRO., CH.12.60.4., 374-5.
4. REC.III., 16-17 November 1869, SRO., CH.12.60.4., 389-93.
5. A.P.Forbes, *Pastoral letter of the Bishop of Brechin on the Admission of the Laity into Synod*, (1870), xxxi.
6. Ibid., xxxii.
7. Ibid., xviii.
8. Brechin Diocesan Synod Minutes, 1 June 1870, BrMS.4.1.3., 152-5.
9. A.P.Forbes to R.Thom, n.d., BrMS.1.4.846.
10. REC.III., 16 November 1870, SRO., CH.12.60.4., 398.
11. A.P.Forbes, *The Claims of the Laity*, (1873).
12. *May Laymen have Decisive as well as Consultative Votes in the Sacred Synods of the Church: A case for the Bishops of Brechin, Aberdeen and Glasgow*, (1873).
13. "The Community of S.Mary and S.Modwenna". A short typewritten account of the Community by Sister Constancia who attempted to revive the Dundee community in the 1870's. Included in the Community's records in the keeping of St. Mary's, Broughty Ferry.
14. Perry, 153.
15. Marion Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*, (1966), 133.
16. History by Sr. Constancia, Op.Cit.
17. A.P.Forbes, *A Plea for Sisterhoods*, (1849).
18. History by Sr. Constancia, Op.Cit.
19. Thomas Williams & Allan Campbell, *The Park Village Sisterhood*, (1965), 69.
20. Peter Anson, *The Call of the Cloister*, (1955), 279 n.2.
21. Mackey, xxx.
22. Biographical note on Forbes by a Miss Trench, Bodleian, Ms.Eng.Misc., d.1096, f.13-24.
23. Benedicta Ward, "A Tractarian Inheritance", in *Tradition Renewed*, (1986), 218.
24. T.Embury, *The Catholic Movement and the Society of the Holy Cross*, (1931), 93; & Mackey, 143.
25. G.Grub, *My Years in Dundee with Bishop Forbes*, (1912), 40.
26. Allan Cameron, *Religious Communities of the Church of England*, (1918), 164-5; & M.V.Woodgate, *Father Benson Founder of the Cowley Fathers*, (1953), 61-3.
27. Anson, Op.Cit., 280, 300; & Woodgate, ibid, 66.
28. Mackey, 192.
29. A.P.Forbes, *Of the Deepening of the Spiritual Life*, (1884), 59.
30. Ibid., 39.
31. Ibid., 58.
32. Ibid., 66.
33. Mackey, 185.
34. Ibid., 186-9.
35. A.P.Forbes to W.E.Gladstone, 3 August 1873, Gladstone Papers, BL.44154, f.312.
36. Mackey, 200.
37. Brechin Diocesan Synod Minutes, 1 October 1874, BrMS.4.1.3, 186.
38. S. & O.Checkland, *Industry and Ethos:Scotland 1832-1914*, (1984), 112-3.
39. Brechin Diocesan Synod Minutes, 1 October 1874, BrMS.4.1.3, 186.

40. R.D.Anderson, "Education and the State in nineteenth-century Scotland", in *Economic History Review*, second series, v.36, (1983), 525.
41. Brechin Diocesan Synod Minutes, 1 October 1874, BrMS.4.1.3, 186.
42. Grub, Op.Cit., 12-13.
43. P.T.Marsh, *The Victorian Church in Decline*, (1969), ch.7.
44. A.P.Forbes to E.B.Pusey, n.d.[1874], PH., PPCUP.5.40.
45. Brechin Diocesan Synod Minutes, 5 October 1875, 194-5.
46. Mackey, 206-7.
47. *The Guardian*, 13 October 1875, 1286.
48. *The Scottish Guardian*, 22 October 1875, 219.
49. Mackey, 208-211.
50. Biographical note by a Miss Trench, Bodleian, Ms.Eng.Misc., d.1096, f.13-24.
51. H.P.Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol.iv, (1897), 296.
52. *The Scottish Guardian*, 15 October 1875, 192.
53. *The Scottish Guardian*, 22 October 1875, 220.
54. J.H.Newman to J.Nicolson, 11 October 1875, *Letters & Diaries of John Henry Newman*, vol.xxvii, (1975), 366.
55. *The Scottish Guardian*, 15 October 1875, 192.
56. Ibid., 192.
57. Quoted in ibid., 192.
58. Quoted in ibid., 192.
59. Quoted in ibid., 192.
60. *The Guardian*, 13 October 1875, 1286.
61. *The Scottish Guardian*, 10 December 1875, 321.
62. *The Scottish Guardian*, 19 November 1875, 273.
63. *The Guardian*, 8 December 1875, 1568.
64. Ibid., 1568.
65. Ibid., 1568.

8

CONCLUSION.

The widespread mourning for Forbes' death in Scotland and England leaves no doubt that sympathetic contemporaries considered they had lost a significant Churchman. An historical judgement on that significance is hampered because of the destruction or loss of most of Forbes' personal correspondence. This deprives the historian of much valuable evidence concerning Forbes' personality and motives. What evidence does remain, however, confirms contemporary opinion of the important impact Forbes made within the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Church of England, and among Churchmen in Europe.

To gain a perspective on Forbes' life it is helpful to see it in phases. The first phase, from his birth in 1817 to 1847, including his first years as a priest, was the formative period of his life. During the second phase, from 1847 to the late 1850's, Forbes developed his ideas in his early years as a bishop and pastor in Dundee. In the third phase, from 1857 to the end of the 1860's, Forbes rose to leadership within the Episcopal Church and beyond, in response to a succession of challenges to his beliefs. Finally, in the last phase of his life, during the 1870's, Forbes' revitalised beliefs became increasingly out of step with developments in British society.

The first phase of Forbes' life, from 1817 to 1847, began with his childhood, where the major influences were his father and grandfather, devout Episcopalians, who passed on to Forbes their sympathy for the eighteenth-century nonjuring tradition of the Episcopal Church. This tradition was evident chiefly in monarchic diocesan episcopacy and the Scottish Communion Office. His upbringing meant Forbes was also moulded by aristocratic Tory society in Edinburgh, and his family's practice of paternalistic philanthropy. But Forbes' education exposed him to greater anglicizing influences than either his father or grandfather. The most important legacy of his short time in India, from 1837 to 1839, was a favourable first experience of Catholicism, probably through his exposure to the Roman Catholic missionaries there. This impression was deepened and fostered in Forbes by his contact with the Oxford Movement after 1840. Forbes experienced a first-hand encounter with the Tractarian leadership as an Oxford undergraduate, primarily though his friendship with Edward Pusey. Because of Pusey's rather grim, introverted spirituality, one negative result of his influence was to exacerbate Forbes' scrupulousness. However, the movement indelibly disposed Forbes to believe in the Catholic nature of the Anglican Church, and to strive for that Church's holiness as an expression of its truth. The most important legacies of the Oxford Movement for Forbes were a belief in dogmatic theology as an accurate, almost sacramental, expression of the Church's divine revelation; and an orientation of his ministry towards the urban poor. This disposition towards a ministry to the poor was reinforced for the recently-ordained Forbes between 1845 and 1847 by his work in the Tractarian parishes of Oxford and Leeds. His months in Leeds also taught him to be cautious over ritualism as he experienced the divisiveness it could cause. A ministry within the Church of England was interrupted for a few months in 1846, when he took temporary charge of the Episcopal congregation at Stonehaven, which further accentuated his sympathies for the nonjuring Episcopalian tradition.

Forbes' election as Bishop of Brechin in 1847, owing to influential connections within the Episcopal Church, was the start of the second phase in his life, in the development of a distinctive Tractarian episcopate. He endeavoured to exemplify a response to the new industrialized urban society for the previously introverted Scottish Episcopal Church. He set a personal example by living among the poor of Dundee, to minister to them regardless of denomination. It was an example unique among Scottish or English bishops. Some of Forbes' social commitment was motivated by his inherited Tory paternalism and aimed at alleviation of the lot of the labouring poor. This was an expression of his belief in a Christian society united in its social hierarchy by bonds of dependence and moral obligation towards the poorest and weakest. But alongside his paternalistic concern for alleviation of the effects of poverty was also Forbes' involvement in various schemes for the permanent economic and moral improvement of the poor, such as his agricultural college. A belief in the "moral economy" was allied to Forbes' Tractarian vision of the Church as a eucharistic community embracing the poor. This motivated his work for church and school extension, to facilitate the development of believing, worshipping, and knowledgeable Churchmembers. The Tractarian inspiration for Forbes' episcopate was also evident in his resourcing of his hopes for a well-read clergy exercising a ministry as confessors and spiritual directors through his building of the Diocesan Library, and though some of his publications. It was during this phase that he became seriously concerned about the increasing religious doubt of the mid-Victorian period. He began to formulate a response by advocating the adoption by the Church of a more dogmatic theology, what he called "an exact theology", believing that a precise, clear doctrine was an important means by which the Church could recover lost or failing confidence in its teaching.

Also during this development phase of Forbes' episcopate, the controversy over the 1850 prayer book, encapsulating the nonjuring liturgical traditions, indicated Forbes was beginning to be thought of as a leader by northern Episcopalians and Scottish Tractarians. Some of them began to look to Forbes in quarrels with their southern counterparts over the place of the Scottish Communion Office. But at that time Forbes was too new to his diocese to bring any decisive influence to bear on his opponents, despite his family's influence in the Episcopal Church.

During the third phase of Forbes' life, from 1857 through the 1860's, he emerged as one of the most important leaders within the Scottish Episcopal Church, and among Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics in the Church of England. Further, he became an important Anglican figure in Europe. In his primary charge of 1857, he contributed to the Tractarian defence of the doctrine of the real, objective presence of Christ in the eucharist, a doctrine which was then under attack in the Church of England. Forbes was not only acting in concert with the Tractarian leaders Pusey and John Keble against erastianism and Protestantism in the Church of England, but also endeavouring to produce in his charge the sort of exact Catholic dogmatics he promoted against religious doubt and secularization. Anglo-Catholic historiography has maintained that the Oxford Movement was the natural heir of the High Churchmen, yet the three-year eucharistic controversy initiated by Forbes' Tractarian teaching increased Episcopalian divisions. His teaching alienated southern Episcopalians who considered its resemblance to Roman Catholic doctrine a threat to Episcopal links with the Church of England. Northern Churchmen, also wary of its Romanism, were resentful of Forbes' criticism of their nonjuring virtualist eucharistic theology. As High Churchmen, both groups of Episcopalians were opposed to Tractarians' criticism of the English Reformation, which to them, was

evident in Forbes' charge. As the controversy developed it drew in the English Tractarian leadership in support of Forbes, and was exacerbated by a lack of clarity about authority over doctrine within the Episcopal Church. In 1860 the eucharistic controvery and Forbes' prospective trial became a *cause célèbre* among English Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics. Failure to convict Forbes of heresy at his trial in 1860, leaving him merely admonished for misleading teaching, left the way open for the continued propagation of Tractarianism within the otherwise almost uniformly High Episcopal Church. In this way, Forbes' charge, initially proposed to strengthen dogmatic teaching, directly caused the Episcopal Church to become more diverse theologically. In the short term, the eucharistic controversy ended the unity between northern Episcopalians and Tractarians beginning to emerge in the early 1850's. It also undermined Forbes' own confidence in the catholicity of the Episcopal Church and of Anglicanism generally.

Throughout the 1860's, Forbes' growing uncertainty about the catholicity of Anglicanism, and his consequent search for a viable Catholic authority as a secure foundation for belief, motivated his leadership in various Catholic causes. In 1862, the probability that the Episcopal Church would jettison the Scottish Communion Office as a *quid pro quo* for the English bishops' support of a parliamentary bill to revoke Episcopalian legal disabilities, caused Forbes to campaign for the Office's retention. Forbes was attached to the Office not only because of family and Tractarian sympathies for its theology and Scottishness, but also because it represented to him an example of the Episcopal Church's patristic-based Catholicity. He clung to it as one of the few established Catholic authorities in his Church. The successful campaign for the Office's toleration, culminating at the 1864 General Synod, owed much to Forbes' threatened use of Gladstone's parliamentary influence. Forbes' leadership in this issue also succeeded in reuniting Tractarians and northern

Episcopalians around a common cause. They were largely opposed by anglicized southern Episcopalians who disliked the Scottish Office as an obvious sign of their Church's variance from the Church of England. The demotion of the Office from its former primary authority over the English Communion liturgy climaxed the anglicization of the Episcopal Church during Forbes' lifetime. But despite the anglicizing influences in Forbes' own formative years, his Tractarianism and family sympathies kept him faithful to this principal example of native Episcopalianism. However, the attack on the Office only increased Forbes' uncertainties, and the attraction of Roman Catholicism for him grew during these years. In 1862, he came close to converting, and might well have seceded, had J.H.Newman not been away from home when Forbes went to Birmingham to seek his counsel.

By the second half of the 1860's Forbes believed that reunion between the Anglican Church and Rome would provide the Catholic authority he sought. A previous involvement with this cause, in the formation of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom in 1857, was curtailed at that time because the eucharistic controversy made it impolitic to be publicly associated with Roman Catholics. But from 1864, Forbes was the principal supporter of Pusey's personal dialogue with sympathetic French bishops. This reunion effort made Forbes a European figure. He became a personal friend of the leading liberal Catholic Ignaz von Döllinger. Through his secret correspondence with the Belgian Jesuit, Victor de Buck, Forbes became known to some Roman Catholics as a potential important convert and a leader of the Anglican reunionist `party´. However, Forbes' hopes for reunion were based on the First Vatican Council being a genuine ecumenical *rapprochement*, and these were illusory. To some degree, Forbes was blinded by a need to resolve his own Catholic uncertainties and had to be disabused by Döllinger and Pusey about the strength of ultramontanist opposition in Rome to any

scheme of reunion. The promulgation of the decree of papal infallibility by the Vatican Council in 1870 finally dashed Forbes' hopes. He was unable to accept the new dogma, or any theory of doctrinal development, because of his Tractarian belief in the static normative standard of the early Church's belief and practice. It was ultimately this Catholic authority he rested upon, and this, coupled with his feeling of responsibility towards his congregation and diocese, enabled Forbes to cast aside Roman Catholicism as an illegitimate historical development. His belief in the normative authority of the early Church also revived Forbes' confidence in Anglicanism as a purer example of that norm than Rome and, after 1871, he redirected his reunion hopes to the Old Catholics in Europe who also espoused the early Church as the theological authority.

In the final years of his life, during the 1870's, Forbes' beliefs, entrenched by past conflicts, became somewhat dated compared with the emerging democratic society, hardening class divisions, and movements for working-class autonomy and of antagonism towards religion. Much of the old world remained present in Forbes' mentality, and he still held to a belief in a hierarchical society united by moral obligation and dependency between its orders. So he opposed moves for a more democratic Church by the inclusion of laity in synods. He was also cautious about the increasing social involvement of the state. In regard to popular education, Forbes realised the resources of the state were necessary to meet the widspread need, but he distrusted the associated secular pressure for non-denominational Christian teaching in state schools. However, fundamentally Forbes' criticism of various changes in society during the 1870's derived from his renewed Tractarianism, more than from his class attitudes. He was against lay representation primarily because he saw a theologically-ignorant or indifferent laity as a threat to doctrinal precision and the control of the Church by the bishops. He was cautious

about state education because he believed only Church schools would teach doctrine definite enough to motivate behaviour. His Tractarianism also inspired his opposition to the English Public Worship Regulation Act in 1874 as the act of an erastian state attempting to compel the consciences of ritualist clergy, although Forbes himself remained a cautious ritualist. The revitalised Tractarianism of his last years was most evident in Forbes' endeavours for a holy Church and the growth of spirituality. His promotion of the vowed religious life was, in part, the espousal of the Church as an alternative community with differing values to contemporary British society, especially for women.

Forbes' untimely death in 1875 cut-off what may have become an even more prominent leadership in the Scottish Episcopal Church. The 1870's were a period of renewed high church predominance in the Church of England, and Anglo-Catholicism was beginning its lasting rise within the Scottish Episcopal Church. Also, by 1875 Forbes had been joined by one or two like-minded men among the Scottish bishops. Given his pre-eminence, these factors would possibly have furthered Forbes' influence which may, in turn, have increased the Episcopal Church's social involvement. But, in one important respect, it would have made the Episcopal Church a hostage to the future. Dogmatic theology was not the solution for religious doubt that Forbes believed it to be. The future of Anglicanism lay with an acceptance of biblical criticism, and that of Anglo-Catholicism with the liberal Catholicism of men like Charles Gore. These both exploded upon Anglicanism in the essays of *Lux Mundi* in 1889. Forbes' attachment to a pre-critical dogmatic theology would have led the Episcopal Church into an historical dead-end, and only increased its difficulties in accepting the insights of the *Lux Mundi* school.

But Forbes' remains an historically significant figure. As the first Tractarian bishop, he was an inspiration and a leader to many in his lifetime, both within his own Church and in the Church of England. Forbes sought to uphold the independence of the Church against erastianism and secularism, and promoted within the Episcopal Church both Tractarianism's doctrine and its critique of the English Reformation. His commitment to the labouring poor was an admirable initiative difficult to make for a man of his refined sensibilities. Yet it was this sacrificial personal example among Dundee's slums, more than his Tractarian doctrine, that did most to legitimize and encourage the Catholic revival in the Scottish Episcopal Church. Forbes was a fundamental catalyst both in making the Episcopal Church more responsive to the needs of Scottish society, and in making Scotland more aware of the Episcopal Church. He brought a breadth and depth of theological and pastoral vision to the small Episcopal Church unequalled by his peers among the Scottish bishops, which raised the theological awareness and standards of the Episcopal Church. Being at the forefront of early ecumenical initiatives by Anglicans of the Catholic revival made Forbes' name familiar to many European Roman Catholics. His widespread connections in England and Europe helped to make the Scottish Episcopal Church known far beyond Scotland, and exposed that Church to various religious movements beyond its borders. Yet for all his international involvement in his own day, it is the example of Forbes' work among Dundee's poor which most endures.

APPENDIX.

The final Canon XXX read as follows:

Of Holy Communion.

1. Whereas the Episcopal Church in Scotland, under the guidance of divers learned and orthodox Bishops, has long adopted and extensively used a Form for the celebration of the Holy Communion, known by the name of the "Scotch Communion Office," it is hereby enacted that the adoption of the Book of Common Prayer as the Service Book of this Church shall not affect the practice of the Congregations of this Church which now use the said Scotch Communion Office. In such congregations the use of the said Scotch Communion Office shall be continued, unless the Incumbent and a majority of the Communicants shall concur in disusing it.
2. The Office of the Book of Common Prayer shall be used in all new Congregations, unless the majority of the applicants mentioned in Canon XX, section 1, shall declare to the Bishop at the time of sending their resolutions to him that they desire the use of the Scotch Office in the new Congregation, in which case the Bishop shall sanction such use. The use of the said Office shall be continued in such Congregation, unless the Clergyman and a majority of the Communicants shall concur in disusing it.
3. Whenever it may appear to the Bishop that any undue influence has been exercised in an application for the use of the Scotch Office, it shall be in his power to refuse such application, subject to an appeal to the Episcopal Synod.
4. At all Consecrations, Ordinations, and Synods, the Communion Office of the Book of Common Prayer shall be used.
5. In every Congregation the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper shall be administered on the Great Festivals of the Church, and at least once in every month, except under special circumstances, to be approved of by the Bishop.
6. In the use of either the Scotch or the English Office, no amalgamation, alteration, or interpolation whatever shall take place.
7. Every Clergyman shall observe the Rubrics applicable to the Office used.
8. When persons join a Congregation, with the intention of remaining therein, they shall, previously to receiving Holy Communion, produce, if required by the Clergyman, from the Incumbent of the Congregation to which they previously belonged, or, in the event of the Incumbency of the Congregation being vacant, from a Communicant of this Church, an attestation that they are Communicants in the Episcopal Church.

Code of Canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church, (1863), 29-31.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Published works by Alexander Forbes.

Forbes, A.P., "On Religious Guilds", in *The Ecclesiastic*, vol.1, (1846), 49-53.

_____, "Parochial Work in France", in *The Ecclesiastic*, vol.1, (1846), 81-89.

_____, "The Revolution and the Nonjurors", in *The Ecclesiastic*, vol.1., (1846), 213-222.

_____, *A Catechism to be learnt before the Church Catechism*, (London, n.d.).

_____, *A Companion to the Altar, adapted to the Office for the Holy Communion according to the use of the Scottish Church*, (Aberdeen, 1847).

_____, *Questions for Self-Examination for the Use of the Clergy*, (London, 1848).

_____, *Jesus our Worship: A Sermon preached at the Consecration of St. Columba's Church, Edinburgh*, (Edinburgh, 1848).

_____, *The Cry of the Prophet: A sermon preached in St. Mary's, Montrose, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Leonard Morse, B.A. Oxon.*, (Montrose, 1848).

_____, *A Plea for Sisterhoods*, (London, n.d.).

_____, *The Christian's Foundation: A sermon preached in St. John's Chapel, Aberdeen, on the occasion of laying the first stone of a new church under the same dedication*, (Aberdeen, 1849).

_____, *The Christian's Converse: A Practical Treatise*, (London, 1849).

_____, ed., *Meditations on the Suffering Life on Earth of our Lord and only Saviour. From the French of Pinart*, (London, 1850).

_____, *A Commentary on the Te Deum*, (London, 1850).

_____, *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed, for the use of persons beginning the Study of Theology*, (Oxford, 1852).

Cantus, [A.P.Forbes], *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus of the Church in Scotland, on the Subject of the Hon.W.E.Gladstone's proposal to admit the laity into the Synods of that Church*, (Edinburgh, 1852).

_____, *The Prisoners of Craigmacaire: a story of the '46*, (London, 1852).

_____, ed., *The Nourishment of the Christian Soul: or mental prayer rendered easy by meditation on the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. With Exercises and Prayers. From the French of Pinart*, (London, 1852).

_____, *A Commentary on the Canticles, used in the Divine Service*, (London, 1853).

_____, *"Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest": An Earnest Exhortation to Confession*, (London, 1853).

_____, *The Holiness of the Human Body*, (London, 1853).

_____, *The Duties of Society*, (London, 1853).

_____, transl. & adapted, *Memoriale Vitae Sacerdotalis or Solemn Warning of the Good Shepherd Jesus Christ. A work of devotion for the use of the Clergy. From the Latin of Arvisinet. Adapted to the use of the Anglican Church*, (London, 1853).

_____, *Suffering; the Great Earthly Sanctifier: A sermon preached in St. Paul's Church, in behalf of the Dundee Royal Infirmary, on the fifth Sunday in Lent, 1853*, (Dundee, 1853).

_____, *A Memoir of the Pious Life and Holy Death of Helen Inglis*, (London, 1854).
_____, *A Commentary on the Litany*, (London, 1855).
_____, *Are You Being Converted? A Course of Sermons on Serious Subjects*, (London, 1856).
_____, *A Commentary on the Seven Penitential Psalms*, (London, 3rd. ed., 1857).
_____, *Sermons on the Amendment of Life*, (London, 1857).
_____, *Primary Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese at the Annual Synod*, (London, 1857).
_____, *Opinion in the Appeal of the Rev. P. Cheyne against the sentence of the Bishop of Aberdeen*, (Edinburgh, 1858).
_____, *A Letter to the Congregation of S. Paul's, Dundee*, (1859).
_____, *Answers for the Right Rev. Dr. Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin to the Presentment against Him at the instance of the Rev. William Henderson, incumbent of St. Mary's, Arbroath, and Patrick Wilson and David Smith, vestrymen of said church*, (Edinburgh, 1860).
_____, *Theological Defence for the Right Rev. Alexander Penrose Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin, on a Presentment by the Rev. W. Henderson, and Others, on certain points concerning the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, (London, 1860).
_____, *Reply to the Pleadings in the case Henderson and Others versus the Bishop of Brechin, before the Episcopal Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church*, (Edinburgh, 1860).
_____, *The Waning of Opportunities and other Sermons, Practical and Doctrinal*, (London, 1860).
_____, *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Brechin in Synod Assembled, in S.Paul's Church, Dundee, on the 27th of August, 1862*, (Dundee, 1862).
_____, *Sermons on the grace of God and other Cognate Subjects*, (London, 1862).
_____, *The Sanctity of Christian Art: a sermon preached at the Reopening of the Chapel at Roslin on Easter Tuesday, 1862*, (Edinburgh, 1862).
_____, *A Sermon preached at the Chapel Royal, Savoy Street, Strand, before the Church Penitentiary Association on Thursday, May 12, 1864*, (London, 1864).
_____, *The Notes of Unity and Sanctity in reference to Modern Scepticism*, (London, 1864).
_____, "Account of a manuscript of the Eleventh Century by Marianus of Ratisbon", in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland*, vol.vi, (1864), 33-41.
_____, & Forbes, G.H., ed., *Liber Ecclesiae Beati Terrenani de Arbuthnott: Missale Secundum usum Ecclesiae Sancti Andreae in Scotia*, (Burntisland, 1864).
_____, Η ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ: *The Scottish Office done into Greek*, (London, 1865).
_____, *The Seal of the Lord: a catechism on Confirmation*, (London, 1866).
_____, ed., *Meditations on the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Four Evangelists, by the Abbot of Monte Cassino*, (London, 1866).
_____, *Our Lord; The Sufficing Manifestation of the Eternal Father in Nature and in Grace: a sermon*, (Dundee, 1867).
_____, *An Explanation of the Thirty Nine Articles*, (2 vols., Oxford, 1867 & 1868).

_____, "Some Account of Robert Watson, with reference to a portrait of him, painted by Professor Vogel von Vogelstein, now presented to the Museum", in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland*, vol.vii, (1867-8), 324-334.
_____, "On Greek Rites in the West", in *The Church and the World:Essays on Questions of the Day*, ed. O.Shipley, (London, 2nd. ed., 1868).
_____, "Notice of the Ancient Bell of St. Fillan", in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland*, vol.viii, (1869-70), 265-276).
_____, *Draft of the Order for Evening Prayer on Sundays, in addition to that Provided in the Book of Common Prayer*, (London, 1870).
_____, *Notes of Eight Meditations given at a Retreat for Clergy held in Dundee by the Bishop of Brechin in November 1869*, ed. J.Nicolson, (Dundee, printed for private circulation, 1870).
_____, *The Body is for the Lord. The Substance of a Sermon preached...in behalf of the Church Penitentiary Association, on Thursday, May 4th, 1871*, (London, 1871).
_____, *The Church of England and the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility*, (Oxford, 1871).
_____, ed., *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, (Edinburgh, 1872).
_____, *The Claims of the Laity to Vote as Constituent Members of Synod Practically Considered: A Charge delivered to the Synod of Brechin on the 2d of October 1873. To which is appended a Pastoral Letter on the same subject issued in 1870*, (Dundee, 1873).
_____, *Lives of S.Ninian and S.Kentigern*, (Edinburgh, 1874).
_____, *The End of the Way, the Beginning of the Life*, (Dundee, 1874).
_____, *Letter to the Congregation of S. Paul's, Dundee*, (1875).
_____, ed., *Remains of the Late Rev. Arthur West Haddan*, (Oxford, 1876).
_____, *Of the Deepening of the Spiritual Life*, (Edinburgh, 1884).

2. Manuscripts.

Aberdeen Papers, BL., MS.43247.
Baldoven Institute minute books, DUL., THB.8.3.1-3.
Blackwood Papers, NLS., MSS.4061, 4186, 4192, 4209.
Blomfield Papers, LPL., v.39.
Brechin Diocese Papers, Dundee University Library.
Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity Papers, Pusey House, Oxford.
Burton (John Hill) Papers, NLS., MSS.9397, 9397, 9399.
De Buck, Forbes and Pusey correspondence, Pusey House, Oxford.
Devine Papers, NLS., MS.1273.
Dowden Papers, NLS., MS.3560.
Educational Returns, Scottish Episcopal Church, SRO., CH.12.64.15,
East India Company Papers, IOR., O.1.97; L.AG.20.1-4, L.AG.23.8.1.
Eeles Collection, LPL., MSS.1524, 1543.
Forbes, (Bishop) correspondence, Pusey House, Oxford.
Forbes (A.P.) Papers, St. Paul's Cathedral, Dundee.
Forbes (A.P.) miscellaneous papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Forbes (A.P.) Trial documents, Scottish Episcopal Church, SRO., CH.12.60.10(iv).
Forbes, A.P., "The Anglican Theory of Absolution", ms. sermon, (1875), Coates Hall Library, Edinburgh, pXLVII(19).

Forbes, (A.P.) "Let me die the death of the Righteous and let my last end be like his", ms. sermon, (1875), Coates Hall Library, Edinburgh, pXLI(i).
Forbes (George Hay) Papers, SAUL., MS.19.
Forbes (William) Journal, NLS., MS.1539-45.
_____, correspondence, SRO., CH.12.12.2412.
Gladstone Papers, BL., MSS.44763, 44154.
Haileybury College Papers, IOR., MSS.J.1.52, 94, 99, 104.
Hamilton Papers, Pusey House, Oxford.
Jenkins Papers, LPL., MS.1604.
Jolly (Alexander) Letters, SRO., CH.12.30.97, 151, 171, 194, 150; CH.12.14.150
Keble correspondence, Pusey House, Oxford.
Laing Papers, EUML., MSS.La.II, IV.
Lee (F.G.) Papers, LPL., MS.2074.
Longley Papers, LPL., MSS.vv.6, 7.
Minto (third Earl of) Papers, MS.12346.
Minutes of Episcopal Conferences, Scottish Episcopal Church, SRO., CH.12.60.9.
Miscellaneous pamphlets & letters, black trunks, General Synod Office, Scottish Episcopal Church.
Miscellaneous Papers, LPL., MS.3417.
Morton Papers, NLS., MS.81.1.17.
Pusey correspondence, Pusey House, Oxford.
Pusey Papers, Pusey House, Oxford.
Register of the College of Bishops, Scottish Episcopal Church, SRO., vol.I, (1743-1819), CH.12.60.1; vol.II, (1822-60), CH.12.60.3; vol.III, (1860-72), CH.12.60.4; vol.IV, (1872-99), CH.12.60.6.
Routh Papers, Magdalen College, Oxford, MS.490.
Royal Infirmary (Dundee) Papers, DUL., THB.1.4.1-4; 1.1.3-5.
Rutherfurd Letters, NLS., MS.9718.
St. Columba's church, Edinburgh, correspondence and histories, SRO., CH.12.5.34, 45, 74, 81.
St. Paul's Cathedral records, Dundee.
Saltoun Papers, NLS., MS.17342.
Selbourne Papers, LPL., MS.1895.
Scott Papers, Pusey House, Oxford.
Tait Papers, LPL., vv.79, 81, 142, 167, 199, 420.
Torry (Patrick) Letters, SRO., CH.12.12.2412; GD.2.173.

3. Books, pamphlets, articles published before 1900.

Alison, A., *A Sermon preached in The Episcopal Chapel, Cowgate, Edinburgh, November 16, 1806, The Day after the funeral of Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo, Bart.*, (Edinburgh, 1807).
Anderson, W., *The Scottish Nation; or the Surnames, Families, Literature, Honours, and Biographical History of the People of Scotland*, (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1859-63).
Ball, T.I., "Recollections of Bishop Forbes and of Dundee Two and Thirty Years ago", in *The Scottish Standard Bearer*, vol.ix, (1898), 74-75, 116-7, 140-1, 155-58.
The Bishop of Brechin and his Flock or the War in Blinshall Street. By an Observer, (Dundee, 1868).

Buckland, C.T., *Social Life In India*, (London, 1884).
Burgon, J.W., *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, (London, 1891).
Butler, A., *Lives of the Saints*, (12 vols., London, n.d.).
Chambers, W., *A History of Peebleshire*, (Edinburgh, 1864).
Chesney, G., *Indian Polity: a view of the system of administration in India*, (London, 1894).
Cheyne, P., *The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated*, (Aberdeen, 1843).
__, *Six Sermons on the doctrine of the Eucharist*, (Aberdeen, 1858).
Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement:Twelve Years 1833-1845*, (London, 3rd ed., 1892).
Cockburn, H., *Journal of Henry Cockburn*, (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1874).
__, *Memorials of his Time*, (Edinburgh, 1856).
__, *Circuit Journeys by the late Lord Cockburn*, (Edinburgh, 1889).
The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, as revised, amended, and enacted, by an Ecclesiastical Synod, holden for that purpose, at Edinburgh, on the 29th Day of August, and continued by adjournment till the 6th of September, inclusive, in the Year of our Lord MDCCCXXXVIII, (Edinburgh, 1838).
Code of Canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church, (Edinburgh, 1863).
Coleridge, J.T., *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble*, (Oxford, 1869).
Danvers, F.C., Monier-Williams, Sir W., et.al., *Memorials of Old Haileybury College*, (Westminster, 1894).
Documents relative to the Proceedings of the Special Meeting of the College of Bishops held at Edinburgh on May 27 1858, (Edinburgh, 1858).
Drexilius, J., *The Heliotropium; or, Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine Expounded in Five Books*, transl. by Reginald N. Shuttle with a preface by the Bishop of Brechin, (London, 1863).
Dundee Lodging House Association, (Dundee, 1848).
Dundee Directory, (Dundee, 1850-1875).
[Edinburgh Academy] *Prize List of the Edinburgh Academy*, (1831 & 1832).
The Edinburgh Almanac or Universal Scots and Imperial Register for 1836, (Edinburgh, 1836).
Forbes, G.H., "Eucharistical Adoration", in *The Panoply*, vol.ii, (Burntisland, n.d.), 263-314.
Forbes, J.H., *A Short Account of the Edinburgh Savings Bank*, (Edinburgh, 1815).
__, *Observations on Banks for Savings; to which is prefixed a Letter to the Editor of the Quarterly Review*, (Edinburgh, 1817).
__, *On English Episcopal Chapels in Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1846).
__, *Address to the members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 2d ed., 1847).
Forbes, W., *Narrative of ther Last Sickness and Death of Dame Christian Forbes*, ed. Alexander P. Forbes, (Edinburgh, 1875).
Foster, J., arr. & ann., *Alumni Oxoniensis:the members of the University of Oxford 1715-1886*, (4 vols., Oxford, 1887).
Froude, R.H., *Remains of the late R.H.Froude*, (2 vols., London, 1838).
Grub, G., *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1861).
Henderson, W., *Pleadings in the case Henderson and Others v. the Bishop of Brechin before the Episcopal Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church*, (Edinburgh, 1860).
Humphrey, W., *Recollections of Scottish Episcopalianism*, (London, 1896).
Kay, J., *A series of original Portraits and Caricature Etchings by John Kay*, (Edinburgh, 1877).

Kaye, J.W., *The Administration of the East India Company:a history of Indian Progress*, (London, 1853).
Keble, J., *On Eucharistical Adoration*, (Oxford, 1857).
Keene, H.G., *A Servant of John Company:Being the Recollections of an Indian Official*, (London, 1897).
Kinloch, M.G.J., *A History of Scotland:Chiefly in its Ecclesiastical Aspect*, with an introduction by A.P.Forbes, (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1874).
Lathbury, T., *A History of the Non-Jurors*, (London, 1845).
Lawson, J.P., *History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time*, (Edinburgh, 1843).
Lewis, G., *The State of St. David's Parish; with remarks on the moral and physical statistics of Dundee*, (Dundee, 1841).
Liddon, H.P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, (4 vols., London, 1893, 1894, & 1897).
Mackey, D.J., *Bishop Forbes:a memoir*, (London, 1888).
May Laymen have Decisive as well as Consultative Votes in Sacred Synods of the Church:A case for the Bishops of Brechin, Aberdeen and Glasgow, (Edinburgh, 1873).
Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Dundee, September 1867, (Dundee, 1868).
Neale, J.M., *The Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D.*, (London, 1856).
Newman, J.H., *Arians of the Fourth Century*, (London, 3rd ed., 1871).
__, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B.Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon*, (London, 1866).
__, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, ed. M.J.Svaglic, (1st ed. 1864; Oxford, 1967).
__, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. C.S.Dessain et.al., (Oxford, 1961-).
New Statistical Account of Scotland, (vol.xi, Edinburgh, 1845).
Nicolson, J., *In Memoriam:a sermon preached in S.Salvador's Church, Dundee, on Sunday the 17th October, 1875, being the Sunday after the Funeral of the Right Rev. A.P.Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin*, (Dundee, 1875).
Pattison, M., "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England 1688-1750", in *Essays and Reviews*, (6th ed., London, 1861).
__, *Memoirs*, (London, 1885).
Pitligo, Lord Alexander, *Thoughts concerning Man's Condition and Duties in this Life, and his Hopes in the World to Come, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author by Lord Medwyn*, (Edinburgh, 1834).
Pollen, J.H., *Narrative of Five Years at St. Saviour's, Leeds*, (Oxford, 1851).
Prospectus of St. John's Agricultural Home, Drumlithie, in the Diocese of Brechin, for the sons of farm labourers, with explanation, and illustrative letters, (Montrose, 1853).
Pusey, E.B., *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Doctrine of the English Church, with a vindication of the reception by the Wicked and of the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ, truly present*, (Oxford, 1857).
__, *The Church of England a portion of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church, and a means of restoring visible unity. An Eirenicon, in a Letter to the author of "The Christian Year"*, (London, 1865).
Rattray, T., *An Essay on the Nature of the Church,* (Edinburgh, 1728).
Robertson, Joseph, *Scottish Abbeys and Cathedrals*, incl. a biography of the author, (Aberdeen, 1893).
Russell, E.F., ed., *Alexander Heriot Mackonochie:a memoir*, (London, 1890).
The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, (Edinburgh, 1851-1863).

The Scottish Guardian, (Edinburgh, 1875).
Simeon, A.B., *A Short Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Chamberlain M.A.*, (London, 1892).
Skene, F.M.C., *A Memoir of Alexander, Bishop of Brechin*, (London, 1876).
Skinner, J., *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, from the Year 1788 to the Year 1816 Inclusive*, (Edinburgh, 1818).
Stephen, W., *History of the Scottish Church*, (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1896).
Thomson, T., ed., *A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Statesmen, originally edited by Robert Chambers*, (London, 1875).
Torry, P., *A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy and Laity of the United Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, from their Bishop*, (Edinburgh, 1846).
Tracts for the Times, (6 vols. in 5, London, 1834-41).
Tulloch, J., *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century*, (Leicester, 1971 repr. of 1885 ed.).
Walker, W., *Life of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly and the Right Reverend George Gleig*, (Edinburgh, 1878).
__, *Three Churchmen:Sketches and Reminiscences*, (Edinburgh, 1893).
Wordsworth, C., *Notes to Assist towards Forming a Right Judgement on the Eucharistic Controversy*, (1858).
__, *Proposals for peace or a few remarks on The Eucharistic Doctrine of Bishops Taylor, Ken, and Wilson with reference to the recent pastoral of the Bishop of Brechin*, (Edinburgh, 1859).
Wordsworth, J., *The Episcopate of Charles Wordsworth*, (London, 1899).

4. Books, pamphlets, articles published since 1900.

Allchin, A.M., *The Silent Rebellion:Anglican Religious Communities 1845-1900*, (London, 1958).
__, *Alexander Penrose Forbes:the search for Integrity*, (Dundee, 1977).
Altholz, J.L., "The Warfare of Conscience with Theology", in *The Mind and Art of Victorian England*, ed. J.L.Altholz, (Minneapolis, 1976).
Anderson, R.D., "Education and the State in nineteenth-century Scotland", in *Economic History Review*, second series, vol.36, (1983), 518-534.
Anson, P.F., *The Call of the Cloister:religious communities and kindred bodies in the Anglican Communion*, (London, 1955).
Archibald, J., *A Ten Year's Conflict and subsequent Persecutions; or, a struggle for Religious Liberty*, (Dumfries, 1907).
Avis, P., "The Shaking of the Seven Hills", in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol.32, n.58, (1979), 439-455.
Best, G., *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-1875*, (London, 1971).
Borsch, F.H., "'Ye Shall be Holy': Reflections on the Spirituality of the Early Years of the Oxford Movement", in *Anglican Theological Review*, vol.lxvi, (1984), 347-359.
Brandreth, H.R.T., *The OEcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement*, (London, 1947).
__, *Dr Lee of Lambeth*, (London, 1951).
Brilioth, Y., *The Anglican Revival:studies in the Oxford Movement*, (London, 1933).
Brown, C.G., *The Social History of Religion in Scotland since 1730*, (London, 1987).

Broxap, H., *The Later Non-Jurors*, (Cambridge, 1924).
Büschkuhl, M., *Great Britain and the Holy See 1746-1870*, (Blackrock, Co.Dublin, 1982).
Butler, C., *The Vatican Council 1869-70*, (London, 1962).
Butler, P., *Gladstone:Church, State and Tractarianism.A Study of his religious ideas and attitudes, 1809-1859*, (Oxford, 1982).
Cameron, A.T., *Religious Communities of the Church of England*, (London, 1918).
Cashdollar, C.D., *The Transformation of Theology, 1830-1890:Positivism and Protestant Thought in Britain and America*, (Princton,New Jersey, 1989).
Chadwick, O., *The Victorian Church*. (2 vols, London, 1966).
__, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*, (London, 1960).
__, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1975).
__, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement:Tractarian Essays*, (Cambridge, 1990).
Checkland, O., *Philanthropy in Victorian Scotland:Social Welfare and the Voluntary Principle*, (Edinburgh, 1980).
Checkland, S & O., *Industry and Ethos:Scotland 1832-1914*, (London, 1984).
Cheyne, A.C., *The Transforming of the Kirk:Victorian Scotland's Religious Revolution*, (Edinburgh, 1983).
Cobb, P.G., "Thomas Chamberlain - a forgotten Tractarian" in *Studies in Church History*, ed., D.Baker, vol.16, (Oxford, 1979), 373-387.
Currie, R., et.al., *Churches and Church-Goers:Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700*, (Oxford, 1977).
Davie, G.E., *The Democratic Intellect:Scotland and her Universities in the Nineteenth Century*, (Edinburgh, 2d ed., 1964).
Dawson, C., *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, (London, 1933).
Delehaye, H., *The Work of the Bollandists through three centuries 1615-1915*, (Princeton, 1922).
Dowden, J., *The Scottish Communion Office 1764*, (Oxford, 1922).
Drummond, A.L., & Bulloch, J., *The Church in Victorian Scotland 1843-1875*, (Edinburgh, 1975).
The Early History of the Church of St. Columba by the Castle, (Edinburgh, 1927).
The Edinburgh Academy Register, (Edinburgh, 1914).
Edwardes, M., *Raj:the story of British India*, (London, 1969).
Elliot-Binns, L.E., *English Thought 1860-1900:The Theological Aspect*, (London, 1956).
Ellis, I., *Seven against Christ;a study of `Essays and Reviews'*, (Leiden, 1980).
Ellsworth, L.E., *Charles Lowder and the Ritualist Movement*, (London, 1982).
Embury, J., *The Catholic Movement and the Society of the Holy Cross*, (London, 1931).
Farrington, A., *The Records of the East India College Haileybury & other Institutions*, (London, 1976).
Ferguson, W., *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, (Edinburgh, 1968).
Forbes of Brechin:an unofficial Patron Saint of the Scottish Episcopal Church, (n.d.).
Forrester, D., *Young Doctor Pusey:a Study in Development*, (London, 1989).
Foskett, R., "The Episcopate of Daniel Sandford 1810-30", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xv, (1966), 141-152.
__, "The Drummond Controversy", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xvi, (1969), 99-109.
Franklin, R.W., "Pusey and Worship in Industrial Society", in *Worship*, vol.57 n.5, (1983), 386-412.

Frappell, L., " `Science in the Service of Orthodoxy´:The Early Intellectual Development of E.B.Pusey", in *Pusey Rediscovered*, ed., P.Butler, (London, 1983).

Fuller, R.H., "The Classical High Church Reaction to the Tractarians", in *Tradition Renewed*, ed., G.Rowell, (London, 1986),

Gardner, B., *The East India Company*, (London, 1971).

Gauldie, E., ed., *The Dundee Textile Industry 1790-1885*, (Edinburgh, 1969).

__, "The Middle Class and Working Class Housing in the Nineteenth Century" in *Social Class in Scotland:Past and Present*, ed. A.A.MacLaren, (Edinburgh, n.d.).

Gifford, J., et.al., *Edinburgh*, (Harmondsworth, 1984).

Gilbert, W., *Edinburgh Life in the Nineteenth Century*, (Glasgow, 1989 repr. of 1901 ed.).

Gladstone, W.E., *The Gladstone Diaries*, ed., M.R.D.Foot & H.C.G.Matthew, (9 vols., Oxford, 1968-).

Goldie, F., *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, (London, 1951).

Greenfield, R.H., "Such a Friend to the Pope", in *Pusey Rediscovered*, ed. P.Butler, (London, 1983).

Griffin, J.R., "The Radical Phase of the Oxford Movement", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol.27, (1976), 47-56.

Grisbrooke, W.J., *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, (London, 1958).

Grub, G., *My Years in Dundee with Bishop Forbes of Brechin 1871-75*, (Edinburgh, 1912).

Hales, E.E.Y., *Pio Nono:A Study in European politics and religion in the nineteenth century*, (London, 1954).

Hardelin, A., *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*, (Uppsala, 1965).

Heyer, F., *The Catholic Church from 1648 to 1870*, (London, 1969).

Himmelfarb, G., *The Idea of Poverty:England in the early industrial age*, (London, 1984).

Hinchliff, P., *Benjamin Jowett and the Christian Religion*, (Oxford, 1987).

Houghton, W.E., *The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870*, (New Haven, 1957).

Inglis, K.S., *Churches and the Working Class in Victorian England*, (London, 1963).

Jemolo, A.C., *Church and State in Italy 1850-1950*, (Oxford, 1960).

Johnston, J.O., *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon*, (London, 1904).

Jones, O.W., *Isaac Williams and his circle*, (London, 1971).

Ker, I., *John Henry Newman:A Biography*, (Oxford, 1988).

Kitson Clark, G., *Churchmen and the Condition of England 1832-1885*, (London, 1973).

Knight, C., "The Anglicising of Scottish Episcopalianism", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xxiii, part 3, (1989), 361-377.

Lathbury, D.C., ed., *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*, (2 vols., London, 1910).

Latourette, K.S., *A History of the Expansion of Christianity: vol.4, The Great Century in Northern Africa and Asia A.D.1800-A.D.1914*, (London, 1944).

Lenman, B., "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism", in *Ideology and Conspiracy:Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. E.Cruickshanks, (Edinburgh, 1982).

Lochhead, M., "The Christian Sacrifice:The Eucharistic Tradition of the Scottish Episcopal Church", in *Theology*, vol.67 n.531, (1964), 388-394.

__, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*, (London, 1966).

McCulloch, J.H., & Stirling, K.J., *The Edinburgh Savings Bank 1836-1936*, (Edinburgh, 1936).
MacLaren, A.A., *Religion and Social Class:The Disruption Years in Aberdeen*, (London, 1974).
__, ed., *Social Class in Scotland:Past and Present*, (Edinburgh, n.d.).
Maclean, A., "Episcopal Worship in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries", in *Studies in the History of Worship in Scotland*, ed., D.Forrester & D.Murray, (Edinburgh, 1984).
Magnusson, M., *The Clacken and the Slate:The story of Edinburgh Academy 1824-1974*, (London, 1974).
Marsh, P.T., *The Victorian Church in Decline:Archbishop Tait and the Church of England 1868-1882*, (London, 1969).
Matthew, H.C.G., "Edward Bouverie Pusey:From Scholar to Tractarian", in *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. vol.xxxii, (1981), 101-124.
__, *Gladstone 1809-1874*, (Oxford, 1988).
Mechie, S., *The Church and Scottish Social Development 1780-1870*, (London, 1960).
Middleton, R.D., *Dr Routh*, (Oxford, 1938).
Millar, A.H., *Jubilee of the Albert Institute 1867-1917*, (Dundee, 1917).
Moss, C.B., *The Old Catholic Movement, its Origins and History*, (Hillspeck, Arizona, 2d ed., 1977).
Mowat, J.D., *Bishop A.P.Forbes*, (Edinburgh, 1925).
New Catholic Encyclopaedia, (18 vols., Washington D.C., 1976-89).
Newsome, D., *Two Classes of Men:Platonism and English Romantic Thought*, (London, 1974).
Nockles, P., "The Oxford Movement:historical background 1780-1833", in *Tradition Renewed*, ed.G.Rowell, (London, 1986), 24-50.
Norman, E.R., *Church and Society in England 1770-1970*, (Oxford, 1976).
O'Donnell, G., "The Spirituality of E.B.Pusey", in *Pusey Rediscovered*, ed., P.Butler, (London, 1983).
O'Gara, M., *Triumph in Defeat:Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops*, (Washington, D.C., 1988).
Overton, J.D., *The NonJurors:Their Lives, Principles, and Writings*, (London, 1902).
Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed., F.L.Cross & E.A.Livingstone, (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1974).
Parry, J.P., *Democracy and Religion:Gladstone and the Liberal Party 1867-1875*, (Cambridge, 1986).
Peck, W.G., *The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement*, (New York, 1933).
Pennie, G.N., "The Trial of the Rev. Patrick Cheyne for Erroneous Teaching of the Eucharist in Aberdeen in 1858", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xxiii, part 1, (1987), 77-93.
Perrier, J.L., *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century*, (New York, 1909).
Perry, W., *George Hay Forbes:A Romance in Scholarship*, (London, 1927).
__, *The Oxford Movement in Scotland*, (Cambridge, 1933).
__, *Alexander Penrose Forbes:Bishop of Brechin, the Scottish Pusey*, (London, 1939).
Philips, C.H., *The East India Company 1784-1834*, (Manchester, 1940).
Prebble, J., *Culloden*, (London, 1961).
Prestige, L., *Pusey*, (London, 1933 repr.1982).
Primrose, J.B., "The Pitsligo Press of George Hay Forbes", in *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions*, vol.iv, (1962), 55-89.

Purcell, E.S., *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle*, (2 vols., London, 1900).
Reardon, B.M.G., *From Coleridge to Gore:A Century of Religious Thought in Britain*, (London, 1971).
__, *Liberalism and Tradition:aspects of Catholic Thought in nineteenth-century France*, (Cambridge, 1975).
Rowell, G., *The Vision Glorious*, (Oxford, 1983).
__, ed., *Tradition Renewed:The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, (London, 1986).
Selby, R.C., *The Principle of Reserve in the Writings of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, (Oxford, 1975).
Shannon, R., *Gladstone 1809-1865*, (London, 1982).
Shepherd, D., Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, 1847-1875, [a brief biography], [Dundee, 1975].
Sikka, R.P., *The Civil Service in India:Europeanisation and Indianisation under the East India Company 1765-1857*, (New Delhi, 1984).
Smout, T.C., *A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830*, (London, 1972).
__, *A Century of the Scottish People 1830-1950*, (London, 1986).
Soloway, R.A., *Prelates and People:Ecclesiastical Social Thought in England 1783-1852*, (London, 1969).
Squires, T.W., ed., *In West Oxford:Historical Notes and Pictures concerning the Parish of S.Thomas the Martyr, Oxford*, (London, 1928).
Stephenson, A.M.G., *The First Lambeth Conference 1867*, (London, 1967).
Stuart, E.B., "Unjustly Condemned? Roman Catholic Involvement in the APUC 1857-64", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol.41, (1990), 44-63.
Taylor, B., "Bishop Hamilton", in *Church Quarterly Review*, vol.155, (1954), 235-248.
Thomas, I., *Haileybury 1806-1987*, (Haileybury Herts., 1987).
Thompson, F.M.L., *The Rise of Respectable Society:A Social History of Victorian Britain 1830-1900*, (London, 1988).
Thompson, K.A., *Bureaucracy and Church Reform*, (Oxford, 1970).
Towle, E.A., *John Mason Neale, a memoir*, (London, 1907).
Walker, W.W., *Juteopolis:Dundee and its textile workers 1885-1923*, (Edinburgh, 1979).
Ward, B., "A Tractarian Inheritance:the religious life in a patristic perspective", in *Tradition Renewed*, ed., G.Rowell, (London,1986), 214-225.
Ward, W.R., *Victorian Oxford*, (London, 1965).
Waterman, A.M.C., "The Ideological Alliance of Political Economy and Christian Theology 1798-1833", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol.34, (1983), 231-244.
Webb, C.C.J., *A Century of Anglican Theology and Other Lectures*, (Oxford, 1923).
__, *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement*, (London, 1928).
White, G., "New Names for Old Things:Scottish Reaction to Early Tractarianism", in *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*, ed. D.Baker, (Oxford, 1977).
Williams, T.J. & Campbell, A.W., *The Park Village Sisterhood*, (London, 1965).
Withrington, D.J., "Non-Churchgoing c.1750-c.1850:A Preliminary Study", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xvii, (1972), 99-113.
__, "The Churches in Scotland, c.1870-c.1900:Towards a New Social Conscience", in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, vol.xix, (1977), 155-168.
Woodgate, M.V., *Father Benson Founder of the Cowley Fathers*, (London, 1953).
Yates, N., *The Oxford Movement and parish life; St. Saviour's, Leeds 1839-1929*, [Borthwick Papers, no.48], (York, 1975).

__, *Leeds and the Oxford Movement; a study of "high church" activity in the rural deaneries of Allerton, Armley, Headingly and Whitkirk in the diocese of Ripon, 1836-1934*, [Thoresby Society Publications, vol.55], (Leeds, 1975).

5. Theses.

Crooks, D.W.T. "The Effects of the Oxford Movement in the Scottish Episcopal Church in the Nineteenth Century", unpublished B.D. thesis, Trinity College, Dublin, 1983.

Jurich, J.P., "The Ecumenical Relations of Victor de Buck, S.J., with Anglican leaders on the eve of Vatican 1", 3 vols., unpublished Doctor of Sacred Theology thesis, Catholic University of Louvain, 1988.

Nimmo, A.E., "Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews 1853-1892:Reconciler or Controversialist", unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1983.